

UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

RECORDS

OF THE

American Catholic Historical Society

OF

PHILADELPHIA

Volume XXVII



143962
17/10/17

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY

1916

E
184
C3A4
v.27

COPYRIGHTED, 1916

BY

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY
OF PHILADELPHIA

RECORDS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOL. XXVII

MARCH, 1916

No. I

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY AT THE ANNUAL MEETING, DECEMBER 21, 1915

One of the first evidences of civilization—indeed it is the earliest use of written language—is the manifestation of a desire to record passing events for the information and guidance of future times ; and one of the triumphs of modern civilization is that painstaking delving and research which have brought to light the culture of nations long buried in oblivion. The mission of the American Catholic Historical Society embraces the task of preserving the materials of present-day history for the use of the future historian and the labor of gathering together the documents and monuments of by-gone days that the life of the past may be reconstructed. So the Society aims to diffuse the historical spirit by which the records of the present may be preserved and the spirit of investigation by which the records of the past may be rescued from oblivion. The library and museum of the Society where are housed books and pamphlets, manuscripts and pictures, newspapers and souvenirs, all the materials out of which history is woven, aim to furnish a work-

shop where the historian of the Church in America may labor among authentic documents.

A Catholic Historical Society is a kind of insurance society, striving by preserving the sources of history to insure the Church against misrepresentation, for there is no more favorite and no more telling attack that can be made on the Church than that drawn from the pages of history. The office of the Society is not, however, that of a Catholic Truth Society, nor is it merely an organization for antiquarian research out of sole love of delving into the dust of the past. While it makes no claim to filling a loud-crying need nor to performing an indispensable service for Catholicity in America, it is not on the other hand a mere luxury of Catholic erudition. In treasuring up the memorials of the life of the Church in America, the Society is doing a work of real service for religion, a work which means much even for conversions into the fold.

Surely the record of Catholicity in America is an added evidence of the divine character of the Church, of her four distinguishing marks as the Church of Christ. To those who have merely the current traditional notions of American history it is hardly less than amazing to learn of the important role played by Catholics in the drama of the Western world especially during the centuries of discovery and exploration, while it is positively startling to learn of the civilizing influence of Catholics in Spanish America. The story of Catholicity in America is an inspiring one and one that is little known. Spread the knowledge of the glories of the Church in the annals of American history and faith will be strengthened and new enthusiasm enkindled for things Catholic. Those who visited the Panama Exposition last summer returned, after seeing the California Missions and learning of the civilization brought by the Franciscan Padres in the

south-west, the non-Catholics with lessened prejudices and the Catholics with increased pride in their faith.

Any one who has tried to do even a bit of local research work, for example the writing of the history of a parish of even recent erection will appreciate the convenience, not to say necessity of a central storehouse, where the sources of history can be preserved. The materials of American Catholic history are scattered abroad and because they are so dispersed many of them will be irretrievably lost. There is no doubt but that most valuable historical matter finds its way to the fire or the junkheap because of neglect to store it where it would be preserved from destruction. Important historical documents have lain buried in dust in old chests and forgotten cupboards often rescued from destruction by the merest accident. The aim of the Catholic Historical Society is to save just such material. Its motto might well be the Scriptural expression: "Colligite fragmenta ne pereant."

Our library and cabinet should be a depositary for all historical material that is worthy of preservation, and often more is worthy of preservation than its possessor imagines, that the investigator into the facts of history may come to this old mansion with the assurance that he will find the object of his quest. This Society must not be looked upon as a purely local institution. Its name indicates its scope, the *American* Catholic Historical Society. Not only the history of this great archdiocese falls within the province of the Society but of the entire nation and of all America, North and South, so that its aim might well be expressed in an adaptation of the Terentian phrase, "*Americani nihil a me alienum puto.*" The first service, then, which can be rendered to this Society is to supply it with the raw materials of history: books, papers, pictures, letters, diaries, relics,

the records of the present and the souvenirs of the past. There is hardly an individual who has not in his possession things interesting and valuable to the scholar of American Catholic history; let him deposit such possessions here where they will be safe from destruction and available for the use of investigators.

A word as to the important question of the support of the Society. The first means of support is an adequate membership. There surely are five thousand Catholics in this city alone who are Catholic to the degree of being interested in the history of the Church in America and who are able financially to spend five dollars a year for the collection and preservation of the sources and monuments of that history. Many do not join the Society because they have not the time or have not the ability to do research work themselves but by their membership they can make it possible for others to do it. Some do not join our ranks because the work of the Society does not appeal to them. True, it is not a charitable work like caring for the sick and the orphans, providing for the deaf and the blind, the aged and the helpless. But it is nevertheless a work worthy of the support of Catholics; for it is one of those intellectual activities which keep alive that spirit of charity which provides for the afflicted and the needy. This is the age of the glorification of the merely useful. "What good is it?" is the question constantly asked; and unless that good is of a very utilitarian order, a good that is tangible and which may be distinctly labeled, most people will none of it. There is no doubt that this Society does real good for the cause of the Church, more good than most Catholics realize and more good than can be definitely catalogued.

Apart from a large membership of workers and supporters of workers, the Society might well be financed by an endowment fund. Such a fund has been started

but it never reached greater than infant proportions. Our wealthy Catholics might follow the example of a distinguished Catholic gentleman of this city who has recently given one thousand dollars to our endowment fund. It is no exaggeration to say that there are at least fifty persons in Philadelphia alone who are quite able if they were equally willing to contribute the same sum. The constant worry about supports hampers very much the work of the Society. Every year and every month we see treasures of historic material pass forever beyond our reach because of our poverty. Were we adequately financed the library would grow, greater clerical force could be provided, archivists could be placed in the great libraries of the world to ransack them for historic lore and so could be unearthed documents which would correct many a biased story and our influence for good would be every way extended. Much has been done with our limited; means seeming miracles could be wrought with adequate resources.

The report of the Board of Managers will chronicle the activities of the Society during 1915. I wish merely to call special attention to our increased membership and to the added prestige of the Society, which has become better known and understood, owing in great part to its having been made a social center to bring our Catholics into closer association. The same social activity will characterize our life in 1916, the new year to be auspiciously opened by a reception to his Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate. We trust that with increased co-operation on the part of our fellow Catholics the year will see no less than an immense increase in our membership and at least a partial realization of our hope to insure the life and usefulness of the Society by a permanent endowment.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

REPORT OF BOARD OF MANAGERS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY FOR THE YEAR 1915

Your Secretary submits the following report of the Board of Managers for the year 1915.

During the year two changes have been made in the By-laws of the Society: the first changes Section 3, Article V, so that it now reads: "the Board of Managers shall hold meetings monthly at such time as they may appoint"; the second alteration is an amendment to Article IV making all former presidents of the Society members of the Board of Managers with the right to attend meetings and vote on any subject that may come up.

The floor space of the library has been enlarged by making use of the rooms in the annex at the rear of the Hall formerly occupied as a residence. These have been furnished and shelving erected, the latter relieving the overcrowded condition of the shelves in the main library.

The two appeals issued by Dr. L. F. Flick during the year for a binding fund resulted in total receipts of \$774. The same gentleman was also instrumental in the publishing of a very attractive Handbook of the Society, and the combined efforts of Father Lallou and Dr. Flick resulted in the addition of the following 88 new members to our roll:

MISS ALICE ATHERTON,
REV. D. J. BROUGHAL,
MR. J. MARECHAL BROWN, JR.,
MR. LOGAN M. BULLITT,
REV. A. B. CAINE,
CATHOLIC GIRLS' HIGH SCHOOL,
MR. PETER CAVANAUGH,
MR. JOHN J. CHAULK,

CHRISTIAN BROTHERS OF ST.
MICHAEL'S SCHOOL,
DR. WM. L. CLARK,
REV. J. M. CORRIGAN, D.D.,
REV. MICHAEL CRANE,
MR. WILLIAM P. CUNNINGHAM,
REV. J. C. DAVEY, S.J.,
REV. JOSEPH P. DEVER,

REV. E. G. DOHAN, O.S.A.,
 MR. JOSEPH A. DOLAN,
 REV. M. C. DONOVAN,
 MR. ALBERT J. DOONER,
 HON. D. WEBSTER DOUGHERTY,
 MISS MARY E. DUGAN,
 MR. EDWARD J. DU MEE,
 REV. L. E. FARRELL, C.S.Sp.,
 REV. F. J. FLOOD,
 REV. EDWARD M. GALLAGHER,
 MR. JOSEPH F. GALLAGHER,
 HON. JAMES E. GORMAN,
 REV. PETER GUILDAY, D.D.,
 MR. A. A. GUMPERT,
 MR. FRANK HARDART,
 SISTER ANTONELLA HARDY,
 MISS MARGARET HARRITY,
 MRS. S. J. HICKEY,
 MR. PETER J. HOBAN,
 MR. J. W. HOOVER,
 REV. LAURENCE HORVATH,
 MRS. M. P. HOWLETT,
 REV. WILLIAM J. HOWLETT,
 MR. WM. LEONARD HURLEY,
 REV. THOMAS J. HURTON,
 REV. ROBERT HYNES,
 MR. CHARLES B. JOY,
 REV. JOHN W. KEOGH,
 REV. JOSEPH KUCZYNSKI,
 REV. FRANCIS J. LAMB, S.J.,
 MR. JOHN K. LOUGHLIN,
 DR. LOUIS F. LOVE,
 MR. F. A. McCARRON,
 MR. HENRY MCCONNELL,
 RIGHT REV. JOHN J. McCORT, D.D.,
 MR. JOSEPH T. McDEVITT,
 DR. JOHN A. MCGLINN,
 MISS ROSALIE McMICHAN,

MRS. JAMES P. McNICHOL,
 MR. W. J. McSHANE,
 MR. FRANCIS J. MANEELY,
 MISS ANNA T. MICHEL,
 REV. M. MONKIEWICZ,
 MR. JOHN MOOTZ,
 DR. P. F. MOYLAN,
 MR. FRANCIS T. MULLIN,
 REV. JOS. J. MURPHY,
 MR. JOHN S. O'CONNELL,
 DR. AUSTIN O'MALLEY,
 MR. A. F. QUINN,
 MR. A. F. QUINN, JR.,
 MR. M. P. QUINN,
 REV. M. J. RAFFERTY,
 MISS KATHERINE RALEIGH,
 REV. ROBERT T. RIDDLE,
 MR. T. LAURASON RIGGS, L.M.,
 MR. THOMAS J. ROCHE,
 MR. JAS. A. ROONEY,
 MR. CHARLES J. SHARKEY, L.M.,
 MR. WM. SIMPSON,
 MISS MARY E. SINNOTT,
 MR. JOHN P. SMITH,
 MR. FRANK C. SOMMER,
 REV. J. H. STEINHAGEN,
 SISTERS OF MOUNT ST. JOSEPH,
 Chestnut Hill, to date from 1913,
 DR. A. W. STRECKER,
 MISS FRANCES L. SULLIVAN,
 MR. CHARLES TETE, JR.,
 MR. JOSEPH C. TRAINER,
 MR. BASIL S. WALSH,
 REV. B. J. WARDEIN,
 HON. WILLIAM T. WHEELER,
 REV. JOS. A. WHITAKER,
 MR. HUGH WILSON,
 REV. T. A. WRENN, C.S.Sp.,

Death has removed the following:

MISS JOSEPHINE BORIE,
 RIGHT REV. THOS. J. CONATY, D.D.,
 MR. CHARLES H. DOUGHERTY,
 MRS. A. P. FAST,
 MR. MICHAEL JENKINS,

MR. JAMES W. KING,
 RT. REV. MGR. CHARLES MCCREADY,
 LL.D.,
 MR. W. J. POWER,
 MR. HERMAN RIDDER,

MR. HARVEY J. ROUTT,
REV. THOMAS SHANNON,
MR. ANDREW J. SHIPMAN,
MR. EDWARD P. SLEVIN,

MR. P. H. SPELLISSY,
MR. JOHN C. SULLIVAN,
MR. JOHN A. TOOMEY,
MR. M. I. WELLER,

The Society has been fortunate in the large number of gifts received and the long list of donors, who are named in the annual report of the Librarian, will be printed in an early number of RECORDS.

Father Lallou has succeeded in interesting a number of women members of the Society to form an auxiliary and act as a permanent entertainment committee. The series of fortnightly "At Homes" was inaugurated November 26, 1915, and has so far proved very enjoyable. It is hoped they will be the means of creating more widespread interest in the work of the Society. Other social activities of the past year include a lecture last February by Cecil Chesterton at the Catholic Girls' High School and a Moore Feis in honor of the Irish poet, given May 28, at the New Century Drawing Room.

A portrait of Mr. Martin I. J. Griffin has been purchased by subscription and hung in the hall of the Society.

The library has added to its shelves during the year 201 volumes and 239 pamphlets. The newspaper and magazine file has been increased from 130 to 163 exchanges.

The members of the Publication Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Galbally, have rendered their usual efficient services and made the RECORDS a paying proposition; and Mr. Dohan, Mr. Engel, Mrs. W. J. Doyle and Miss Jane Campbell have added another year of helpful service to the many they have devoted to the Society; in fact, the Board of Managers as a body have given most freely of their time and money.

The following is a list of receipts and expenses for the year ending November 30, 1915:

Report of the Board of Managers

9

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES FOR THE YEAR ENDING NOVEMBER 30, 1915.

Receipts.

Dues from active members.....	\$1945 00	
Dues from contributing members.....	10 00	
Dues from life members	200 00	
		\$2155 00
Advertisements in RECORDS	\$954 00	
Subscriptions to RECORDS	564 35	
Sale of RECORDS.....	9 65	
		\$1528 00
Sale of duplicates	2 25	
Subscription to Endowment Fund	10 00	
Subscriptions to Binding Fund.....	774 00	
Subscriptions to Griffin portrait	100 00	
Donations, St. Vincent's Aid	100 00	
Mr. Samuel Castner, Jr., for book.....	40 00	
Refund of expressage	1 00	
Proceeds of entertainments.....	569 48	
Interest on bonds	190 00	
Interest on deposits, General Fund.....	38 10	
Life Membership Fund	22 20	
Endowment Fund ...	80 35	
		\$5610 38
Balance Dec. 1, 1914		1015 57
		\$6625 95

Expenses.

Interest on mortgage	\$154 00	
Water rent	28 00	
Gas	28 60	
Coal	104 10	
Plumbing repairs, including in- stallation of water meter, over- hauling of heater and repairs to roof.....	193 08	
Repairing furniture	33 90	
Shelving, house furnishings and minor repairs	276 55	
		\$818 23
Binding books and magazines	210 05	
Purchase of books and magazines.	186 58	
Cabinets and pamphlet binders....	14 12	
Extra work in library,.....	83 75	
		\$494 50

Printing RECORDS.....	836 92	
Commissions on advertisements...	491 36	
Printing handbook	97 00	
Cuts and photographs	67 06	
Printing rate cards.....	2 75	
	<hr/>	\$1495 09

Account of Secretary :

Printing, postage, stationery, telephone, car fare, expressage .	350 30		
Commission on new members...	130 50		
Entertainments	348 92		
Federation of Catholic Soc.....	7 50		
Federation of Historical Soc....	2 00		
Salaries, Librarian	1200 00		
Clerk	600 00		
Editor, balance, 1914...	50 00		
Wages of Janitor.....	195 75		
Griffin portrait	100 00		
Deposit in Life Mem. Fund	5 00		
	<hr/>	\$2989 97	\$5797 79
Transfer to Life Mem. Fund.....	200 00		
Transfer to Endowment Fund	10 00		
Balance petty cash.....	8 63		
	<hr/>	218 63	
		<hr/>	\$6016 42
Balance General Fund, Nov. 30, 1915...			\$609 53
Endowment Fund, Bonds.....	\$3900 00		
Deposit in Beneficial Saving Fund.....	160 50		
	<hr/>		\$4060 50
Life Membership Fund :			
Bonds.....	\$1000 00		
Deposit in Beneficial Saving Fund.....	50 00		
	<hr/>		\$1050 00
Memorial Care Fund			\$403 65

In closing this report, may I be permitted to express my admiration of the pioneer work done by the American Catholic Historical Society in gathering material for the history of the Church in America; I wish also to say that the remembrance of the unfailing courtesy and kindly assistance given me during my connection with the Society will be to me always a pleasant memory.

Respectfully submitted,
 JOSEPHINE O'FLYNN,
Secretary.

THE UNVEILING OF THE PORTRAIT OF MR. MARTIN
I. J. GRIFFIN, AT THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC
HISTORICAL SOCIETY, DECEMBER 21, 1915

ADDRESS BY MISS JANE CAMPBELL

It is certainly eminently fitting that there should be in our Historical Society a portrait of Mr. Martin I. J. Griffin, the eminent historian, who was so largely instrumental in founding this Society of ours, which has such an honorable record. It seems like ancient history to refer to the day so many years ago when Mr. Griffin and the late John H. Campbell, Esq., were talking together of historic Catholic matters. "We ought to have a Catholic historical society!" remarked Mr. Griffin. "Let us found one!" was the immediate answer of Mr. Campbell, who further proceeded to send out a call to a number of gentlemen interested in American Catholic history, to attend a meeting for the purpose of organizing such a society. The meeting thus called resulted in the formation of this Society; so all honor must be accorded to the wise and far-seeing founders who builded even better than they knew.

Naturally Mr. Griffin's interest in the Society he had helped to found was unflagging from the day of its inception to the very last day of his life.

Mr. Griffin was born a historian, a good and devoted Catholic, so the work of collecting and preserving Catholic history particularly appealed to him. He well knew the possible value of the most insignificant Catholic fact,

or the vast importance which a circumstance apparently of no moment might assume in the course of time. He was a conservator of old documents, old papers, old anything that could or would in the slightest degree throw light on any historic question. He seemed to have an unerring instinct for discovering the gold in what to the ordinary observer would appear but the merest dross. "The trash of one generation is the treasure of the next," as he often aptly remarked when some old manuscript or old letter or other paper discarded as worthless by the owner, fell into his hands, and proved, as his trained mind had perceived, of great potential value for the future historian.

Mr. Griffin's historical interest had an unusually wide range. In American Catholic questions he was an authority and in those of his own city there was little of importance of a by-gone day with which he was not familiar. The RECORDS of the Society abound in able and interesting articles written by him, elucidating mooted points or narrating events which were almost if not completely forgotten.

His services as Librarian of the Society, terminated all too soon by his death, were many and varied and of the greatest value. Besides the many articles in the RECORDS of the Society and the great number he wrote as editor and owner of the RESEARCHES, he has left some monumental works, such as the *Life of Commodore Barry*, to perpetuate his fame.

So far I have spoken of Mr. Griffin only as a historian, but there are many parts of his character which deserve special comment. He was a seeker after historic truth and his fearlessness in proclaiming it when found, was one of his most striking characteristics.

He was an ardent advocate of temperance, even to the limit of prohibition, and always consistent in its advocacy.

He had a most kindly nature, and his charities, of which only his intimate friends knew, and even they imperfectly, were wide and diverse. And his charities, his benevolences were all performed in a singularly unostentatious manner. He was exceedingly generous and the Society is deeply indebted to him for most substantial donations of many kinds.

This is but a very slight tribute of respect, admiration and esteem for one whose death was an almost irreparable loss to the cause of American Catholic history, but it is hoped that future students of our Catholic history will emulate his example and devote their lives to its preservation with the same devotion and single-mindedness as did Mr. Griffin through his whole useful and honored life.

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE
YEAR 1916.

President—THE REV. WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

Vice-President—MR. JAMES. M. WILLCOX.

Recording Secretary—MISS JOSEPHINE O'FLYNN.

Corresponding Secretary—MISS JANE CAMPBELL.

Treasurer—MR. IGNATIUS J. DOHAN.

BOARD OF MANAGERS.

THE REV. FRANCIS P. SIEGFRIED.

MR. M. F. HANSON.

MR. THOMAS A. DALY.

MR. HERMAN G. VETTERLEIN.

DR. AUSTIN O'MALLEY.

L. F. FLICK, M.D., LL.D.

THE REV. JOS. J. MURPHY, D.D.

MR. JOSEPH M. ENGEL.

MR. EDWARD J. GALBALLY.

MRS. W. J. DOYLE.

HONORARY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD.

(Ex-Presidents of the Society).

THE VERY REV. T. C. MIDDLETON, D.D., O.S.A.

THE RIGHT REV. MONSIGNOR H. T. HENRY, Litt.D.,
LL.D.

MR. WALTER GEORGE SMITH.

MR. SAMUEL CASTNER, JR.

THE RIGHT REV. MONSIGNOR H. T. DRUMGOOLE,
LL.D.

MR. FRANCIS A. CUNNINGHAM.

MR. WILLIAM V. McGRATH, JR.

THE RIGHT REV. MONSIGNOR P. R. McDEVITT.

COMMITTEES.

COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND CABINET

Dr. Lawrence F. Flick, *Chairman*.
The Rev. F. P. Siegfried.
Dr. E. J. Nolan.
Mr. John J. Ferreck.
Mr. Edward J. Du Mée.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORICAL RESEARCH.

The Rev. Jos. J. Murphy, D.D., *Chairman*.
The Rev. E. J. Curran.
The Rev. Peter Guilday, S.T.D.
The Right Rev. Mgr. P. R. McDevitt.
The Rev. S. P. Dever, D.D.
The Rev. F. J. Hertkorn.
The Rev. Edward M. Gallagher.
The Rev. Jos. A. Whitaker.
Mr. P. A. Kinsley.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

Mr. Joseph M. Engel, *Chairman*.
Mr. Jeremiah J. Sullivan, Jr.
Mr. John F. Skelly.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION.

Mr. Edward J. Galbally, *Chairman*.
Mr. James P. Considine.
Mr. Joseph P. Gaffney.

COMMITTEE ON HALL.

Mrs. W. J. Doyle, *Chairman*.
Miss Katherine Brégy.
Mrs. John J. McKenna.
Miss Katherine G. Love.

DON AGUSTIN DE ITURBIDE

BY AUGUSTIN DE ITURBIDE

Concluded

Iturbide made his triumphal entry into the city of Mexico on the 27th of September, 1821—his thirty-eighth birthday. Spanish domination had lasted three centuries, year for year. Describing this entrance of the army of the Three Guarantees into the capital of the empire, Alamán tells of how the throngs received that army, and especially the First Chief, with the liveliest acclamations; adding that this had been the only day of pure enthusiasm and joy, without admixture of sad memories, or the announcement of new misfortunes, that the Mexican people had known in his day. He wrote that in 1851:¹ and the same could be repeated to-day.

Iturbide announced the consummation of their independence to his fellow countrymen in a short proclamation that Alamán qualifies as “worthy of that occasion”;² in the course of it he said, addressing the Mexicans, “*You know now the way to be free; it is for you to show the way to be happy*”.

On the following day, the First Chief convened the provisional Supreme Governing Board, to which he appointed thirty-eight of the most distinguished men in the country, representative of all the parties, and made demission to them of the supreme power that he had exercised during the seven months that had elapsed since the proclamation of the Plan of Iguala.

¹ Alamán, *Historia de México*, Vol. V, p. 257.

² *Ibid.*, p. 258.

The first act of the Board was to decree the Act (declaration of Independence of the Mexican Empire, the second paragraph of which document is as follows:

“The heroic efforts of her (Mexico’s) sons have been crowned, and there has been consummated the eternally memorable enterprise that a genius, superior to all admiration and eulogy, the love and glory of his country, began at Iguala, prosecuted, and carried to its end, overcoming almost unsurmountable obstacles.”

Iturbide had been elected president of the Sovereign Board; as, however, that body named the regency for which the plan of Iguala provided, as soon as they had issued the declaration of independence, Iturbide, having been named president of the regency, ceased to preside over the board. The latter then issued several decrees in recognition of Iturbide’s services: they created for him the rank of Generalissimo Admiral of the forces of land and sea, with the appellation of Serene Highness; this rank which was to cease at the Liberator’s death, carried with it a salary of one hundred and twenty thousand dollars a year, to begin from the day of the proclamation of the plan of Iguala; and they decreed to him a capital of one million of dollars, and a tract of land, twenty leagues square. To Don José Joaquín they decreed the honors and the salary of a regent, which should be changed for those of a counsellor of state, upon the arrival of the emperor.

It may as well be said that Iturbide never took the capital or the lands that were decreed to him; and as he resigned that part of his salary, corresponding to the seven months of the war of independence, the regency published that fact “in order that the people might better know the patriotism and the virtues of their Liberator”,¹ this being the first time that he was officially named Liberator—a title that, many years after his death, was confirmed by law.

¹ Alamán, *Historia de México*, Vol. V, p. 263.

During the month of September, the peninsula of Yucatán, the province of Chiapas, and then, all Guatemala, which comprised the whole of Central America, proclaimed the plan of Iguala and their annexation to the Mexican Empire; and these accessions having been ratified by the government at Mexico, Iturbide sent a column of 5,000 men in support of them, which proved to be necessary only for the establishment of order. On the other hand, the Spanish commandant of Vera Cruz, towards the latter end of October, abandoned that city, and Colonel Santa Anna, whom Iturbide had appointed commandant general of the province of Vera Cruz, entered the town, taking possession of it in accordance with its free proclamation of the plan of Iguala.

There, then, was a free nation, having apparently every element of future prosperity; free, not only as a nation, but in its individuals, for the plan of Iguala also abolished slavery and the distinctions between the races that had been created by the Laws of the Indies; and all found their interests and their aspirations satisfied in that production of the highest statesmanship, the plan which the Liberator had offered at Iguala, and each provision of which had been accepted without the suggestion of an emendation by "the altar, the toga, and the sword"; while it healed the wounds that had been opened by a Vandalic revolution that had lasted six years, and brought into union, under its third guarantee, the poor and the rich, the great and the small, who had been launched into that war against each other.¹ The empire also possessed a vast territory, the wealth of which had been proverbial for three hundred years; while its society had been brought to the highest degree of civilization to which it could be carried by the Spanish realm.

¹ Seward, Lincoln's Secretary, in a conversation with the father of the writer of these notes, expressed his opinion that the plan of Iguala was second, only to the constitution of the United States, among the political documents of the New World.

And this nation, so favored, possessed that other element of united action, and consequent prosperity, that is essential to every people in its first establishment as an independent society; that is, a Hero: a hero whom all loved, whom they claimed to be "superior to all admiration and eulogy", whom each Mexican soldier worshiped, and for whom he would gladly rush to a heroic death. But that hero stood in the way of an enemy that was not known then as now, before which the Liberator was destined to fall, as every other Catholic champion since his day has fallen; that is to say, Free Masonry.

The Spanish constitution of 1812, never obeyed in Mexico, abolished 1814, and as suggested above, re-established in 1820, was a Masonic concoction, directed against royalty and the Catholic Church. Now the first effect of Iturbide's pronouncement at Iguala was the final abolishment of that constitution, in so far as Mexico was concerned, and the promise of a future one, to be formulated according to the needs of the Catholic nation. Accordingly, the Liberator felt the first assault of Free Masonry, during the early days of the campaign of independence, in the desertion of Lieutenant-Colonel Almela, whose lodge at Mexico ordered him, under the severest penalties, even that of death, to withdraw from Iturbide's army; which he therefore did, with the two hundred men whom he commanded.¹ But the campaign of Iguala was soon transformed into too sweeping a victory, for the lodges to successfully attempt further measures against Iturbide, before his entry into the city of Mexico. They continued their conspiracy, however, in their traditional secrecy, and its effective work was shown from the day after the occupation of the capital by the army of the Three Guarantees.

The parties into which the country was divided at that

¹ Alámán, *Historia de México*, Vol. V, p. 114.

moment were the Iturbidist, and the Liberal. The former was for the full enactment of the Plan of Iguala and of the Treaty of Córdoba, except that they wished Iturbide to be raised to the throne. The Liberal party stood for all the measures that had been established by the Spanish constitution, and for the innovations that Free Masonry had brought about in Spain, where the lodges were in full control. This party consisted, in the first place, of the Free Masons:—Free Masonry had been brought to New Spain by the expeditionary troops, the majority of whose soldiers, and all of whose officers, belonged to that sect. The Mexicans did not join the lodges, in at all considerable numbers, during the first years of their establishment in Mexico; but, in the last years of the viceregal government, their numbers were increased. And concerning their activities, as soon as the independence was achieved, Cuevas¹ says: "There was another element of disorder. . . . Some influential Spaniards and Mexicans, knowing well the ease with which the unsuspecting could be deceived, and with which the advantages that they sought could be secured in that way, continued the work that had been begun in the last years of the viceregal government, multiplying the so-called Scottish lodges", that is, the lodges of the Scottish rite of Free Masonry, "and bringing into them the men who manifested themselves as being contrary to, or decided against, the president of the regency. The mystery with which their reunions were covered, the ceremonial which they observed, the doctrine which they sustained, the hatred of kings and of the Inquisition, and more than all, the power that was assumed to be in their hands through their occult and well-combined manoeuvres, inspired a terror, similar to that which had been inspired by the Inquisition itself. . . . Many, through the spirit of novelty, some,

¹ Cuevas, *Porvenir de México*, Book II, p. 189, edition of 1852.

to acquire importance, and to secure important acquaintanceships, and others, for unworthy interests, increased the number of the lodges, so much, that the attention of the authorities was called to them, believing that the established order of things was menaced by them. The fact, however, that it was generally believed that the so-called Free Masons were inimical to the Catholic religion and to the Church, prevented them from obtaining, then or later, that ascendancy which they desired over the masses of the people. . . . The Liberal party admitted all that came to it, and many of its leaders and notable men, having entered the lodges, it was not ashamed to confound its cause with such miserable and low machinations.

“The desire for a government that should give security to the Church, and should leave without effect the decrees that had suppressed the Society of Jesus and the hospitaler orders, while it secured all that was necessary for the maintenance of pious sentiments in all their force, and of the cult in all its splendor, was general in the masses, and in the middle classes, without exception.”

Iturbide, on his part, did nothing that it was not his province to do: he had promised the Mexican people the provisional government of the Board, had created that body, and guided by his profoundly patriotic intentions, had disregarded himself by appointing to it many of his enemies, in order that it should be representative of the entire nation; and having been appointed to the presidency of the regency, which consisted of four other members, besides himself, he did what little he could, in that difficult position, to secure order, pending the meeting of the congress.

Besides the Free Masons, as such, there were affiliated in the Liberal party the former insurgents, those Spaniards and Mexicans who were discontented, those officers of the army who thought that they had not been duly rewarded,

the partisans of exaggerated principles and ideas, and all those who, from that time, began to favor all changes and political disorders.¹

The Governing Board, although its majority was favorable to Iturbide, did nothing to provide for the course of the regency's administration: it did not even provide the funds for the normal expenses of government; until, finally, it formulated the electoral law, and the congress was elected and convened.

The chief business of the congress was to frame a constitution; as, however, its membership contained a very large Liberal representation, it began, from the first day, to occupy itself with nothing but questions that related to the Liberator. This representation, out of all proportion to the size of the Liberal party, was made possible by the fact that the non-Liberals, of whom the Iturbidist party consisted, were totally ignorant of electoral practices, while the Free Masons were guided in these matters by their European members, which is true in regard to all the policies of that sect. For this reason, and because there were so many Spaniards among the enemies of Iturbide, it was called, also, the Spanish party.

As, on the other hand, the president of the regency did nothing that could be directly impugned, and the Catholic religion could not be directly assailed in that early day, the policy of the Free Masons was directed to the misrepresentation of Iturbide's intentions. This work was carried on strenuously in all quarters among the upper classes; and the greatest efforts were bent upon making it successful in the military class, who were not so easily seduced; but "it was observed that officers no longer maintained the same enthusiasm for the First Chief", while "... the lodges daily extended their influence, and prepared a change in the opinion of the military class."²

¹ Cuevas, *Porvenir de México*, Book II, p. 198, ed. of 1852.

² Cuevas, *Porvenir de México*, Book II, p. 199, ed. of 1852.

Iturbide made efforts to win over these enemies to the cause of order and of the country, for it should be remembered that, when Iturbide had been killed, no one, Catholic or Mason, upheld that congress, which did nothing, absolutely nothing, even for the country's most urgent needs; much less did it formulate a constitution, which was the chief end for which it was convened. But he could not win the good-will of enemies who, being separated from him by the chasm that separates the Catholic religion from Free Masonry, had other motives of hatred for him, "because some brought against him the charge that he had defeated them" (the insurgents); "others, that he had overshadowed their prior services; the Liberals that they could not be reconciled with his system, his influence, or his popularity, and the Spaniards and their friends, that he was the fortunate Chief of 1821",¹ for this congress convened on the 24th of February, 1822, the first anniversary of the proclamation of the Plan of Iguala.

And so matters continued, the congress making the public administration of affairs impossible, by blocking the regency in all its functions; when there came the news that Spain had repudiated the treaty of Córdoba, refused to recognize the independence of Mexico, and announced that she would regard its recognition by other powers to be the annulment of existing treaties.

In view of this refusal on the part of Spain to recognize the independence, congress was put in the position of electing an emperor. And thereupon, the Iturbidist party assumed a very active attitude. Iturbide had never done any thing to promote that party or its activities; on the contrary, he had on different occasions repressed them.

On the other hand, there had been a great deal more activity on the part of the Liberals, who menaced the coun-

¹ Cuevas, *Porvenir de México*, Book II, p. 201, ed. of 1852.

try with grave disorders. Bravo, Victoria, and other officers, who were former insurgents, entered into a conspiracy, which was discovered. The conspirators were arrested, but, although their conspiring had been public and notorious, the government was able to prove nothing against the conspirators, who remained free to continue their work. On the other hand, at a meeting of one of the lodges, it had been decided to assassinate the president of the regency. This purpose was denounced to Iturbide, and the latter "made a subject of conversation of what had been resolved at the lodge; which was sufficient for the news to be rapidly divulged throughout the city; and at the same time, he promoted Colonel Valero" (who was the presiding officer of that lodge) "to the rank of Brigadier General, which made the Masons believe that it was Valero who sold the secret of the Society. They thereupon resolved to punish him, which compelled him to abandon the country and return to Spain".¹

On the other hand, the conspiracy against Iturbide in the congress had become proportionately bitter: even the regency had been transformed accordingly, for the three of its members who were friendly to Iturbide had been removed, and three others, who were notoriously inimical to him, had been appointed, so that the president of the regency was left as a minority of one, in the executive branch of the government. All of which was exasperating the people against the congress, while the clergy, which was always addicted to Iturbide, became all the more so, in proportion as it saw the faith, and itself, in danger from the Liberalism of the lodges. The congress, however, at this juncture, was discussing laws for the regulation of the regency, that is, laws restricting the functions of Iturbide; and they were about to approve one, by virtue of which the

¹ Alamán, *Historia ed México*, Vol. V, p. 450.

president of the regency could not have the command of troops. This carried the Iturbidists to so great a degree of indignation that they determined to demand of congress the immediate election of their hero to the throne. What they were preparing, in that connection, has remained unknown; but, on the night of the 18th of May, a sergeant of the regiment of Celaya, named Pio Marcha, armed a few of the soldiers of that body, and marching through the streets, proclaimed Iturbide with cries of "long live Agustin I." He was soon followed by the people, and by the garrison; the houses were all illuminated, and the people, taking possession of the church belfries, put all the bells in the city to ringing, while they made the artillery bring out the guns and fire a salute.

On the following day, the congress, declaring that "the obstacles that the Generalissimo had placed between himself and the throne, in the Plan of Iguala and the Treaty of Córdoba, had been removed by the determination of the Spanish Cortes", elected him Emperor of Mexico.¹ All of the provinces, without the exception of a single corporation, ratified the election, as did the clergy and the army; and there was the same joy throughout the land that there had been when the Liberator announced the consummation of the independence.

A month later, the emperor and empress were crowned at the cathedral, in the most magnificent function that had been seen in the New World. At the ceremony, the bishop of Puebla, one of the four who were present, preached a sermon in which he took for his text the 23rd verse of the 10th chapter of the 1st Book of Kings: ". . . Surely you see him whom the Lord hath chosen, that there is none like

¹ The treaty of Córdoba, in this connection, provided that the crown should be offered, in order, to Ferdinand VII, the Infante Charles, the Infante Francis of Paul, and the heir of Luca; and that if no one of these princes should accept it, the congress should elect whom it would.

him among all the people. And all the people cried and said: God save the king."

On the 22nd of June, the congress declared that the crown was hereditary in the house of Iturbide, that the emperor's eldest son should have the title of prince imperial, and his other sons and daughters that of Mexican prince (or princess), while his father was made Prince of the Union (the Third Guarantee) and his sister Doña María Nicolasa received the title of Princess of Iturbide.

And as by these, and by other, spontaneous acts, as well as by the cessation of all hostile enactments, the congress seemed to enter heartily into the spirit of the nation, there presented itself a most hopeful future. But it proved to be of short duration; for "neither the Free Masons nor the republicans were interrupting their work against Iturbide; the former ceased to promote it by the press, but carried it on secretly, and more effectively. The lodges were greatly increased in numbers, as were, also their proselytes. The republicans, on the other hand, were determined to do away by means of a revolution with the obstacle that Iturbide's personality placed in the way of the realization of their purposes";¹ and those two elements acting in harmony, a revolution was about to break out at the latter end of the month of August; but the conspiracy was denounced, and its leaders reduced to prison. The emperor made the mistake of being lenient with them—(this leniency with his enemies, on all occasions, being the decisive error of his government)—and they, like the leaders of the former conspiracy, were left to conspire on. The only military movement in behalf of this second revolt was made by General Felipe de la Garza, who, after the imprisonment of his co-conspirators, came with many protestations of regret and of future fidelity, to the emperor. The latter generously pardoned him and retained him in his command.

¹ Alamán, *Historia ed México*, Vol. V, p. 494.

Soon, the congress began again its open hostilities; and at the proposal of some of its members, the emperor held a meeting at which were present about forty of them, the council of state, and many high representatives of the army; and it was decided that the various irregularities, attending the existence of the congress and its proceedings, should be remedied by that body itself. The latter refused to act, and after some exchanging of communications between it and the government, the emperor, ceding to obvious necessity, and to the clamor that arose on all sides, dissolved it; and in order that it might not be said that he was usurping the legislative power, he created a board, consisting of members of the late congress, who should exercise legislative functions, until a new congress could be convened.

Came then the incident of Santa Anna. The latter was commanding the troops of Vera Cruz, and so many complaints were made against him by corporations, as well as by private individuals, that the emperor was considering his removal from the command, when General Echavarri, Santa Anna's immediate superior, reported his fear that his subaltern had entered a plot to deliver Echavarri to the commandant of the fortress of Ulua.¹

A communication, therefore, was sent to Santa Anna, informing him that the emperor needed his services at Mexico, and to report accordingly for orders at that city. He, however, having received that order at Jalapa, hastened to reach Vera Cruz before the news of his removal from the command should be known in that city, and proclaimed the republic.

Santa Anna's revolt, of itself, was unimportant: its author was not in concert with other officers, and what scattered troops seconded his movement were defeated by

¹ The castle of San Juan de Ulua is built upon a rock in the sea, about a quarter of a mile from Vera Cruz. It was not taken from the Spaniards until several years after the independence had been achieved.

imperialist commanders, as was he himself, at Jalapa, where he lost his entire force. But soon, Guerrero, Bravo, Victoria, and all of the former insurgents who had been arrested for the first conspiracy, mentioned above, joined Santa Anna's revolt, and although they were routed, wherever found, Santa Anna, himself, was able with their assistance to recruit another force, with which he fortified himself at Vera Cruz.

The emperor sent against that city a competent army, under General Echavarri. But the operations of the siege did not advance as rapidly as the emperor thought that they should do, and he was preparing to take personal command of the besieging force, when news came of the revolt of Echavarri himself. That event is described as follows, by Alamán: ¹

"Echavarri, then, finding himself in these difficulties" (those of the siege and the emperor's dissatisfaction) "and not knowing how to extricate himself from a position that was compromising his military honor, the Masons proposed to themselves to put him in accord with Santa Anna" (in the execution of a program of their own). . . . "Echavarri had then recently been received into the lodges, and had all the obedience of a novice; the same was true of Cortazar, Lobato, and the greater part of the officers of the besieging army, all of whom, moreover, were persuaded that the siege could not be carried on, and that it would have to be raised, to the detriment of their reputations. On the other hand, in the new program" (that of the Masons) "due respect was had for the emperor, and consequently, they" (the officers just mentioned) "did not hesitate to obey the orders of their occult superiors. . . ."

According to those orders, they proclaimed the convening of a new congress, and that they would obey that con-

gress alone. And as the officers of that corps were only some, among the many whom Free Masonry had won into its lodges, this Masonic program was seconded by many, throughout the empire.

All agree that Iturbide was in a position to defend his power,¹ but, seeing that civil war and consequent anarchy would be the price that the country of his creation would have to pay for the support of his empire,² he called together the congress that he had dissolved, and sent to it his abdication, on the 19th of March, 1823, at the same time he informed that body that if his presence was considered a possible cause of disorder, he would gladly withdraw, to live with his family in another country. This was agreed to, it having been determined that he should fix his residence at Leghorn, in the Grand-Duchy of Tuscany.

Accordingly, the Liberator was escorted to a point on the shore, near Vera Cruz, whence he and his family and their accompaniment embarked for Leghorn. On the way to Vera Cruz, Bravo, who commanded the escort, treated Iturbide and his family shamefully, and there was even an attempt at assassination. When they arrived at the shore, the sea was very rough, so that it was dangerous to go in the boats to the ship. The Liberator was informed that if he so preferred, he could await until the next day for the sea to subside. He left the matter to be decided by the empress, and she, "not willing to remain an hour more than was necessary" under the escort of Bravo, the party went forthwith aboard the frigate Rawlins, which in the same hour stood to sea, on the 11th of May.³

¹ Cuevas, *Provenir de México*, Book II, p. 231 (at the top), and various other passages of the same Book.

² Alamán, *Historia de México*, Vol. V, p. 564.

³ Malo, Don José Ramon, *Apuntes Históricos sobre la Salida, del Territorio de México, Regreso, y Muerte de Don Agustín de Iturbide*, MS., Library of Congress.

Cuevas ¹ says that the congress, penetrated with the fact that Iturbide could suppress the revolution, was "timid, weak, and externally respectful to the man who, considered personally, overshadowed all his enemies, and was quite able to visit them with exemplary punishment", but that, when it became evident through the emperor's acts that he would offer no resistance, and would leave the country, the Masons and their allies "gave themselves up to the insensate joy that precedes the great catastrophes of nations." And the congress crowned the first great triumph of the Free Masons in Mexico, declaring the invalidity of the election of the Liberator to the throne, and the insubsistence of the Plan of Iguala and of the Treaty of Córdoba in as far as form of government was concerned.

The voyage of the Liberator, his family, and accompaniment to Europe lasted eighty-three days. On the fifth day, his son Angelo, and the emperor himself, were poisoned by a bottle of bitters; but the evil having been discovered before full draughts were taken, and antidotes having been administered, the effects of the poison passed off before their arrival at Leghorn. During the voyage, the emperor dictated his Manifest, which was later published in various languages.

Upon their arrival at Leghorn, they were subjected to a quarantine of thirty days, notwithstanding the fact that the ship had a clean bill; and at the end of that time, Malo ² refers that their baggage was minutely searched, not even the sewing cushions of the empress and of her daughters escaping.

As soon as Iturbide had found a house, and all were established at Leghorn, he went to Florence to visit the grand

¹ Cuevas, *Porvenir de México*, Book II, p. 231, ed. of 1852.

² In the MS. quoted above. Malo was with Iturbide, and therefore, a witness of all that he relates.

duke (Ferdinand III) who received him with all the formalities of the etiquette. In the early part of November, however, the governor of Leghorn, who had become a friend of Iturbide, informed the latter that he should ask for a letter of security, from which formality no one coming to establish himself in Tuscany could be exempt, no matter what his category. Iturbide acted accordingly, and in reply, received permission to remain in Tuscany only one month more, while the governor received a separate order to watch the emperor's actions. That functionary told Iturbide that in all his experience as governor of Leghorn this action of the government was without precedent, that in his opinion, Iturbide was not safe in Tuscany, and that he would do well to go, without waiting for the end of the thirty days that had been granted, to some country that was not comprised in the Holy Alliance.

Accordingly, without passing through France, the Liberator staged to Ostend, and after a short illness at that port, taking passage on the first steamship that plied those waters, sailed to London. He wanted to put his children at French schools, and therefore had sent them and his wife to Paris; but he was opposed in his purpose by Chateaubriand, then minister of Louis XVIII, on the ground that it might compromise his government with Spain, in view of the then existing Holy Alliance. They all, therefore, were reunited at London.

At the latter city, Iturbide received a proposition from the Spanish government, through the Duke of San Carlos, the Spanish ambassador to France, in which, reminding the Liberator of the ingratitude with which he had been treated by his fellow countrymen, and assuming that he repented having made the independence of a country that was not ready to be free, it was proposed to him to take the command of the expedition that the Holy Alliance was preparing, to send to Mexico, and that, thereafter, he should be

perpetual viceroy. "Iturbide was indignant at such a proposition, made to a man like him; and without answering it, began, then, to prepare his return, being convinced, not only by that proposition, but, also, by all that was said at that time about the expedition in the press, that the independence of Mexico would be in jeopardy, if a timely union were not affected among the Mexicans, who were already divided, as was shown by the revolutions of Lobato and of Guadalajara. There was no lack of persons to offer arms, money, and even volunteers. Then he decided to address to the congress the exposition that he sent, under date of the 13th of February, 1824, which, written in the best of good faith, was answered with the barbarous decree that proscribed him."¹

No sooner had the emperor left Mexico than his enemies, Masons and all, began to contend among themselves for the supremacy of their opposed views, the object of the Masons being, as from the beginning, first to establish a strong central republic, whose government should be subject to the lodges, and secondly, the eventual decatholization of Mexico. And much disorder had ensued. A triumvirate of three Masons, Bravo and two others, was appointed, and with the title of Executive Power, they took the place of the imperial government. Alamán, to whose history of Mexico frequent reference is made in these notes, became the first minister of the Executive Power. He was not a Mason, but, being an able man, with European experience, he was expected to direct the executive power in its government, in all the more satisfactory way, for all of this new régime, in view of his decided enmity for Iturbide.

There were conspiracies and outbreaks—two of them,

¹ Malo, the above MS., which is followed for all concerning the voyage of Iturbide to Europe, his return, and death.

at least, of a serious nature, and no little clamoring for the return of Iturbide.

This being the condition of things, the congress received the above exposition of the 13th of February, in which the Liberator informed them of the purposes of the Holy Alliance, and of the expedition sanctioned above, and that, in view of those facts, he would return to Mexico, to serve as a soldier, simply, against the proposed aggression. Upon receipt of that communication, the congress passed the following law:

“ 1. Don Agustín de Iturbide is declared to be a traitor, and without the protection of the law, if for any reason he presents himself upon Mexican territory. In case he should so do, he is declared to be, by the fact itself, a public enemy of the state.

“ 2. All who may co-operate by encomiastic writings, or by any other means, to his return to the Mexican republic, are declared to be traitors to the federation, and will be judged according to the law of the 27th of September, 1823.”

The law of the 27th of September, 1823, was directed against highwaymen, and provided for their summary execution. So, any newspaper man who might write an article, in which he spoke encomiastically of the liberator of his country, was to be dealt with as with a highwayman.

The Liberator, knowing nothing of all this, put his eldest sons and his daughters at schools in England, and on the 11th of May, the anniversary of his departure from Vera Cruz, he set sail at the Isle of Wight, after having made his eldest son sign a document, resigning the rights that he might claim as heir to the throne.

Iturbide proposed to land at Tampico, but contrary winds drove his ship towards Soto la Marina, where it cast anchor. On this journey there accompanied the Liberator

his wife and his two youngest sons, Fathers Lopez and Treviño, Colonel Beneski, Lon José Ramón Malo, and three servants.

At Soto la Marina Iturbide sent Beneski ashore, to learn of the state of the country. He found that General Felipe de la Garza, the one whom the emperor had pardoned (page 37), was in command of the province (now the State of Tamaulipas); and finding that officer, Beneski presented to him a letter from Father Treviño, who was a relative of Garza. The latter, not knowing that Iturbide was aboard, expatiated with Beneski on the deplorable effects of the emperor's absence; and forthwith answering Father Treviño's letter, Garza asked that ecclesiastic to influence the emperor to return, adding that if he would return by way of Tamaulipas, he, Garza, would supply money, arms, and troops.

Beneski did not know—for none of Iturbide's party knew—that the government, informed by its spies that the Liberator had sailed, or intended to sail, for Mexico, had warned all its officers on the coast to be on the watch for Iturbide's arrival, and to execute, forthwith, the law of proscription. Beneski, therefore, believing in Garza's protestations of good-will, confided to him the fact that Iturbide was aboard the brigantine off the shore. And so, Garza, having attained his end, sent Beneski off, and awaited Iturbide's landing.

"When Beneski delivered Garza's letter to Iturbide, and referred to him the good reception that had been given to Beneski, as well as the expressed wishes of Garza for the emperor's return, he" (Iturbide) "showed the letter to the few of us who constituted his accompaniment. . . . All were very much pleased, except" the empress and Malo, "the former advising her husband not to trust Garza lightly", for she seemed to have a fateful premonition; and Malo, also, offering what advice his prudence dictated,

the Liberator answered, "All of that is fear; if I had acted in that way, to carry out my enterprises, many of them would have failed; it is necessary to risk something; and I am going to do so."¹ And losing no further time, he went ashore with Beneski.

At the shore, they took horses, to go to Soto la Marina, which is about a day's march from the sea, and when they had gone about half of that distance, they were met by Garza. The latter, without giving the Liberator time to speak, exclaimed, "You, here, Mr. Iturbide!" "Yes," answered the emperor, "I came for a turn to my country." "Well," said Garza, "you have exposed yourself, and have compromised me: you are proscribed!"

Iturbide and Garza marched ahead, while Beneski and the troop that accompanied Garza followed at a short distance. On the way the Liberator talked with Garza concerning the motives of his return to Mexico. When they arrived at Soto la Marina, Garza ordered that Iturbide and Beneski remain prisoners, while he held a meeting with his officers. Then the Liberator began the dictation to Beneski of an exposition to the congress, reminding them of his services and of his motive in returning to his country. This dictation, however, had not been finished, when an aide-de-camp of Garza arrived, informing Iturbide that he was to die at three o'clock. Through the same officer, the Liberator asked for the three days that it was habitual to give, even to the greatest criminals, in order that he might pre-

¹ Malo, the MS. quoted above, and who is followed in all that concerns the return and death of the Liberator.—Alaman, in his effort to whiten the conduct of those who intervened in the killing of Iturbide—(his own, among them)—denies that Garza wrote the above letter, and therefore, that anyone saw it; and he does so upon the alleged authority of Malo. It is quite probable that Malo prepared his MS., not only to disclaim responsibility for Alaman's statements, but, to contradict them. The MS. was written some time after the publication of the last volume of Alaman's history.

pare in a Christian way for death, and that he might communicate with his wife. The officer did not return; but, at three o'clock, Garza appeared with his force, and told the Liberator that he had determined to submit the matter of his death to the legislature of Tamaulipas, which was then holding its sessions at Padilla. Accordingly, they started out for that town, and when they were at some distance from Soto la Marina, the Liberator and Beneski were left with a guard, while Garza went off to some distance with the remainder of the force. Iturbide then said to Beneski that they were probably going to execute the law of proscription at that place, fearing, perhaps to do it at Padilla, where there was an artillery corps that was faithful to him. Presently, however, an officer came, asking them to join the others; and when they had done so, Garza informed the Liberator that he had told his officers of the disinterested motives of Iturbide's return to the country, and that all had decided to second his purposes, and to receive him as their general. This was met with hearty acclamations by the officers and troops. Garza then told the Liberator that it was necessary for him to return to Soto la Marina, to prepare all matters there, and that Iturbide might march along with the command, to Padilla, where Garza would join him in a short while.

Iturbide, by a forced march, arrived at the outskirts of Padilla, and there halted, to await the return of officers whom he had sent to inform the legislature of his presence and of the motive for it. They came, saying that the legislature refused to receive him. At the same moment, appeared Garza, saying that he had returned from the way to Soto la Marina, fearing that the Liberator might find difficulty in obtaining a hearing from the legislature. He then suggested that it would be best for Iturbide to enter the town as a prisoner, while Garza, himself, went to the legislature to speak for the former. Iturbide had no alter-

native, and therefore, he and Beneski entered the town as prisoners, and as such, were lodged in rooms on the public square, with a guard.

Garza then went off to confer with the legislature; and at four o'clock in the afternoon, he sent word to the Liberator that the law of proscription would be executed two hours later, conformably to the orders of the legislature. At the same time he left orders that he was not to be called, in the event that Iturbide should wish to speak to him.

"At six o'clock in the afternoon, Iturbide himself announced to the guard that the hour of his execution had arrived. As they took him out to the square, he said to the soldiers: 'let us see, children, I will give to the world a last look', as he looked around him, asking where was the place that had been prepared for his death. . . . When he arrived at the place where he was to be shot, he delivered his watch, and the rosary that he had about his neck, to the ecclesiastic who accompanied him, in order that they might be delivered to his eldest son; he gave to the priest, also, a letter for his wife, and ordered that the gold coins that were in his pocket should be given to the soldiers of the firing squad; and, addressing the people, he said, in a voice so firm that it could be heard through all the square:

"Mexicans! in the act of my death, I recommend to you the love of our country and the observance of our holy religion; it is this that will lead you to glory. I die for having come to help you. I die with honor: not, as a traitor. No; that stain shall not descend to my children. Be subordinate, and obey your chiefs, for so, you do the will of God. I say all of this without vanity, for I am very far from having it." He then recited the creed and an act of contrition, kissed the crucifix that was presented to him, and fell, his head and his breast pierced by bullets, amid the regrets of all who witnessed it."¹

¹ Alamán, *Historia de Mexico*, Vol. V, p. 604.

So ended the brilliant career of the great Catholic, Liberator of Mexico, in the forty-first year of his age.

On the 18th of July, the Liberator, deceived by Garza's words and acts, had sent a note to his wife, bidding her, and those of their company who had remained aboard, to land, and to proceed, forthwith, to Soto la Marina; and they had arrived at that village, ignorant of all, at the hour when the Liberator fell at Padilla.

" . . . at midday, on the 20th, Garza came, and in the afternoon, he sent for Father Lopez—for all had been reduced to prison, except the empress—and he requested that ecclesiastic to inform her of what had happened. "We," says Malo, "heard it on the morning of the 21st, when one of the servants brought it to us, and told us of the impression that it had made upon Madame.

"Garza reported immediately to the government, and awaited its determination with regard to us, we remaining prisoners, until the President ordered our deportation to the United States. Seven or eight days were spent in this way, and when our exile was determined, we were put at liberty, with the condition, however, that we should present ourselves three times a day at the guard. . . .

"The first available ship for our departure was infested. Notwithstanding that fact, Garza wished us to embark upon it; and as Madame refused, he took me, to advise her to sail. In his presence, however, I advised her not to do it, for, if she would persist in her refusal, she would have to be carried, and so, at least avoid having to walk to the sea" (about twenty miles away), "and would make it known that violence was being done her. Then, another ship was sent for, and on the 16th of September, we embarked for New Orleans, leaving behind Madame's French maid, who took service with Garza's wife; and also, Beneski, who was ordered to be tried by a court martial that eventually condemned him to exile. . . .

"We arrived at the mouth of the Mississippi, a few days later, without being able to make port, because the norther of the equinox had begun. Then there came boats of the navy, to take off Madamme and her accompaniment" (which included Father Lopez), "and Father Treviño and I continued our journey on the ship, it having been agreed that we should all meet at Baltimore; wherefore I never saw her again, for I returned to Mexico in April, 1825, by reason of the amnesty. . . ."

A few weeks after the arrival of the empress at New Orleans, she gave birth at that city to the Liberator's posthumous son; and some months later, she journeyed with her accompaniment to Washington, where she established herself at Georgetown.

From that day, her life became a painful struggle against the vicissitudes that beset her, the loss of her property being not the least among them. Her eldest son was sixteen years of age, and there were seven others, of ages ranging down to babyhood. Those of them whom the emperor had left in England had to be brought back from their schools. The then President of the United States offered to the eldest one a military education; but, there having been received, at the same time, an invitation from Simon Bolivar, for him to serve with the rank of colonel under the orders of the Liberator of the south, that invitation was accepted; while the second son, Angelo, was put with the Sulpician Brothers, near Baltimore; the daughters going to the Sisters of the Visitation, at Georgetown, whose convent school was then in a state of incipency. One of them, later, entered that convent as a nun, and died there, before receiving the black veil.

After a painful life of many years in Georgetown, the empress removed to Philadelphia, where her troubles, if any thing, increased; for she had been left dependent upon a pension that had been decreed to her by the Mexican gov-

ernment, soon after the killing of her husband; and that pension, often not paid, was insufficient for her subsistence and that of her family.

The empress died at Philadelphia, on the 21st of January, 1861, and is buried in that city, in a vault of the graveyard of St. John the Evangelist's church. Before her death, an episode occurred that shows the strength of her Christian character: Echavarri—(whose treachery at Vera Cruz was the beginning of the long years of sorrow through which she lived)—like all the others who had betrayed her illustrious husband, had been overthrown and persecuted by ensuing factions; and those of them of Spanish birth had been banished, Echavarri among them. And he, going to Philadelphia, taught Spanish for a livelihood. In time, he fell ill; and the empress, hearing that he was alone and without means, went to him, provided for his want for his needs, and personally nursed him, until the end came, when he died in her arms.

Before the removal of the Iturbides to Philadelphia they had lost their chaplain, Father Lopez. He had been the faithful friend of Iturbide, from the time when the latter first went to the province of Guanajuato, under García Conde; had upheld his reputation at Madrid, against the attacks that were made upon it by the Alamáns and others in 1816; became the emperor's chaplain and confessor, and as such, accompanied him to Europe, and to Soto la Marina; and from there, had come in exile with the empress and her children. And having come with them to Georgetown, he decided to enter the Society of Jesus, which he did. Thereafter, he was for some time President of Georgetown University. The Library of Congress has many of his letters to Iturbide.

In 1833, Santa Anna being president of the republic, a law was enacted, by which it was decreed that Don Agustín de Iturbide should have the title of Liberator, and that a

portrait of him should be hung in every public office. And in 1838, General Bustamante, then president, removed the remains of Iturbide from Padilla to the capital, and with all solemnity reinterred them in the sarcophagus in which they still repose in the cathedral of Mexico.

If the political principles of Don Agustín de Iturbide needed vindication, they would find it abundantly in the history of Mexico, from the time when his power was destroyed, to the present day; for it is the story of a century of disorder and revolutions, brought about in the effort to impose upon the Mexican people the irreligion and the institutions against which the principles of Iturbide stood.

To destroy the enormous force of Iturbide's memory among the Mexican people, his enemies needed two essential results: the destruction of his reputation, which was based upon his works; and the substitution of some hero, in his stead. As regards the second point, there being no one whose identity could fill the space that was occupied by that of the First Chief of the Three Guarantees, the Masons and other anti-Iturbidists selected four, among those who were offered by the atrocious war of insurrection, namely, Hidalgo, Morelos, Allende, and Guerrero, and through teaching in the public schools, through the Liberal press, patriotic speeches, and all other means of education, the Mexicans were taught that those, with their companions, were their heroes, and their true liberators. If the name of Iturbide was mentioned, it was with denegation; his services were belittled, his merits denied, and his motives impugned. But the strongest weapon was, when possible, not to mention him at all.

Then came the writers of history, and these, in their works, followed the above tactics, although, in many instances, they were too bitter to be persuasive; while those who would have shown the works and character of the Liberator in their true light did not write, for they would have

attracted the enmity of those in power. Until, finally, came Lucas Alamán, about the middle of the last century, who wrote a history of Mexico between 1808 and 1824, in five large volumes, which constitute a work of deep research, veridic in all that does not concern Alamán himself. As for the military, and the broad political facts in the Liberator's career, Alamán does them justice, but, he deploys strenuous efforts, to attach to Iturbide's memory guilt in the calumnious charges that the Alamán family brought in 1816. And Alamán having been of the party, and government, that were responsible for the Liberator's death, he attempts to justify that infamy; while he deals with the regency and with the empire in a spirit of ill-disguised animosity. In his own defence, in a note of his history of Mexico, he writes:

" . . . Odious charges having been made against me, in connection with the events here related " (the proscription of Iturbide), " I should say that, when this decree was issued and approved, I was not in the ministry, which I left in January, and to which I did not return until the 15th of May. . . ." ¹ That is, he returned to the ministry two months before the Liberator was killed, during which months the government took active measures for the execution of the decree!

Bulnes, a strong non-Catholic, and Liberal, writing on this subject, in 1910, says:

" . . . The Executive Power was a league, dominated by Alamán. . . . It is worthy of note that Alamán, as minister, intervened as well in the assassination of Iturbide as in the execution of Guerrero." ²

Now Alamán's work became the first authority on the history of the period that embraces the Liberator's career;

¹ Alamán, *Historia de México*, Vol. V, p. 600.

² Bulnes, *La Guerra de Independencia*, p. 415.

and while its misrepresentation of the Hero of Iguala is, in some instances, too much studied to be forceful, it is, in other cases, ably done, amid so much apparent calm, and sound judgment, that only one well versed in Mexican history can refute it. Accordingly, the Liberals have been able to use that work to assail the memory of the Liberator, although it has served the contrary purpose, to a much greater extent.

Alamán and Cuevas, the latter in a more Iturbidist sense, published their works between 1850 and 1856; and the polemics attaching to Iturbide's memory are as live a subject, still, as in that day. The reason is obvious; for, the Masonic party, still busy with its work of decatholization, and with the consolidation of Jacobin institutions and policies—very often with the assistance of the United States (as at the present moment)—cannot tell the people, from whom it seeks its proselytes, that the overtowering figure in their history was a “genius, superior to all admiration and eulogy”, who stood, and who died, for precisely the opposite principles.

That much refers to Mexico; but, also as regards other countries, the Liberals, through their international solidarity, have found it easy to denigrate the name of Iturbide, in works of reference, books of travel, and the press generally, and also, to procure its omission upon effective occasions.

On the other hand, with that settled purpose of misrepresentation, so widely spread, and in the absence of a corresponding conservative propaganda, it is much to be regretted that the truth should find not a full expression, in quarters where one would rightly hope to see its vindication.

Iturbide was essentially a man of religion. On his expeditions, even after the most fatiguing march, he would not take his rest, until he had recited the rosary; and on

the rare occasions upon which he was absent from his command, during the years of insurrection, he would devote a portion of his time to making a spiritual retreat. This principle was dominant in his policies; he regarded the religion of the people as the only foundation upon which to base the hope of national prosperity; wherefore, as much by the dictates of his faith as by those of statesmanship, he made the Catholic religion one, and the first, of his Three Guarantees. Otherwise, he was governed by the principle that his countrymen should seek their national prosperity in the legitimate development of their own customs, traditions, and character, and not, in the importation of political institutions of which they knew nothing more than that some prosperous alien people had adopted them.

But the wise and Christian course along which the Liberator would have led his people was abandoned for the one of de-Catholization, over which Mexico has been dragged, from misfortune to misfortune, for nearly a hundred years, leading from its cryptic starting-point to the spoliation of the Church and the suppression of the religious orders under Juarez, and thence, through the untold evils of the Diaz regime, to the transactions of the present day.

DIARY OF THE REVEREND FATHER MARIE JOSEPH DURAND

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH BY ELLA M. E. FLICK

Conclusion

On one of my journeys on which I encountered all kinds of difficulties and dangers from robbers or from crocodiles, of which there are a great number in this country and which have mouths wide enough to swallow a man whole, since they are about twenty-five feet long, and can seize in their mouth an ox by the middle of its body, I arrived at the house of M. Tucker, a good Catholic who had eight sons and one daughter, all except the youngest married and settled about him in good homes. We had travelled a long time on this marshy ground, in fear every minute of sinking with our horses, and surrounded on all sides by wild beasts and enormous serpents.

But we were well repaid for all our trouble by the warm reception of our excellent Catholic and his family. For seventeen years they had not seen a priest. I enquired how they had passed their Sundays and holy days, without Mass. They answered that on these days all the families of the district assembled three times; the first time they recited the prayers of the Mass; the second time they recited the beads or other prayers and followed this by singing hymns and canticles; and the third time some one of the better instructed taught catechism not only to the children but to the married folks as well. I could not help admiring this beautiful arrangement, which the Holy Spirit who is the Spirit of righteousness and simplicity, has established among these pious planters, so simple and so free from malice.

I imagined myself carried back to that blessed epoch of the birth of the Church. I fancied I saw those first Christians instructed by the Apostles and so united by their charity that they were but one heart and one soul. I would have liked well to have remained with such good people and to have chosen this holy spot for my home but Divine Providence called me elsewhere. However, I did not wish to leave these virtuous souls without giving them hope of again seeing me. Finally to preserve or increase, if such were possible, the concord reigning amongst them, I advised them to build a church.

"It is the one thing you lack," I said to them. "From it you will draw the greatest benefit. On Sundays you could all assemble there. Some one of your number of good reputation and who to piety adds an exact knowledge of his religion, could teach catechism or give some pious reading. You might chant the psalms, some canticles or hymns. All this would be a great aid to fervor and a bulwark against Protestants who will not dare attack you, seeing you so well united. God, for his part, will bless you abundantly and when you are all assembled in His Name He will be pleased to be in your midst." I added as a last motive for their encouragement that if they followed this advice I would return from time to time to visit them and celebrate for them the Holy Sacrifice. I then bade them good-bye and continued my journey. But if I was not with them in body, my heart remained with them.

On the following day they met to consider the building of a church. It was resolved to do so by common agreement. They chose a very beautiful site. Beginning the next day, some prepared the materials, and others worked at its construction with such ardor that in less than two months the edifice was under cover. There were two hundred workers. When it was in readiness

M. Tucker knowing where I lived, came to remind me of my promise. I had been taxing my strength too much, for I had travelled over a region of more than three hundred and fifty leagues visiting various settlements in the Upper Louisiana. I likewise had gone to visit congregations beyond the Wisconsin; and this new foundation which was on the opposite side presented fresh hardships. But I had pledged myself and it was necessary to add this congregation to those I already attended. I held for these good people a feeling of affection that attracted me towards them. Nevertheless difficulties and dangers of travel caused a kind of repugnance. It was necessary to cross several rivers which were very dangerous when high.

However, I overcame all these difficulties. I did not wish to show less courage than the good old man whom these obstacles had not hindered from coming to seek me. The voyage was laborious, but their joy at seeing me in their midst rewarded me abundantly and induced me to return there several times.

M. Flaget, Bishop of Kentucky, came to give Confirmation in my French parish, and I begged him when he had finished to visit this new mission. The good report I gave of it made him comply most willingly with my request. The rivers had subsided and we crossed them without difficulty. Many of the congregation came as far as St. Genevieve, which is seven leagues farther up to meet us. Several of the prominent people of the city accompanied Monseigneur as far as the settlement. On the next day after our arrival everybody gathered in the church and Monseigneur preached so fervently that tears flowed from the eyes of all present. We remained nearly nineteen days with them. Much of this time was spent in baptizing, in preaching and in the confessional.

When we were leaving I promised to see them again

in a little while and stay an entire month. They were overjoyed. I kept my promise, and when I arrived I found that the seed which Monseigneur had planted in these well prepared hearts had produced fruit an hundredfold. Their fervor was admirable; their conspicuous piety and virtues spread in all directions the most beneficent results. It was true in this place in accordance with the word of Isaias that the desert had become the garden of the Saviour. My heart rejoiced to see these spiritual plants visibly thrive before my very eyes and raise themselves day by day towards heaven! How I loved to repeat this canticle of the prophet: "Flores, flores, quasi lilium, etc., frondete in gratiam et collaudate canticum, et benedicite Dominum in operibus suis."

I was so well pleased with these good people that I have since returned there four times a year, although they are forty leagues from my parish. The good Mr. Tucker received me in his home. One day on arriving there I found him ill. I administered the last Sacraments to him and soon after he ended his days full of merit before God. He left some valuable donations to the church in his will.

Every time I visited this congregation I had the good fortune of making some converts of one or the other sex. These new converts were more fervent than the older Catholics. They had more zeal for the conversion of heretics and were often the first cause of their return to the Church, as in all their conversations with Protestants who appeared to have dispositions to become Catholics they never ceased to encourage them to give up their errors and return to the true religion. They instructed and prepared them little by little; they lent them books of controversy; and when they were fully decided, presented them to the priest.

When I learned that M. Dubourg, the newly chosen

Bishop of Louisiana, intended to establish his See in the state of Missouri, that piece of land on which the church of my good Americans had been built seemed to me most appropriate for an institution. Persuaded that nothing would contribute more to perpetuating the good in this parish than an educational institution, I decided to propose to them that they buy the full depth of their land for this purpose.

On the following Sunday I preached on the great advantages of a school for the education of the young and especially for the training of young ecclesiastics. I made them feel that a good work of this kind would place them in a position of never wanting priests. I contented myself on that day with this opening and did not explain matters further; but I said to them that, wishing solely their happiness, I had for the morrow something important to tell them and that I therefore begged them to be present at Mass.

They all came, impatient to know what I had to say to them. I then proposed that they buy the ground mentioned above for a college or a seminary; and fearing they might think I wished to run them into useless expense, since so large an edifice could serve for nothing while they lacked priests for such an institution, I told them of the coming visit of the Bishop and a large number of ecclesiastics, who came to Louisiana only for the purpose of founding an institution, and who would be delighted at an offer so advantageous and so well adapted to the accomplishment of their aims. I added that I might have proposed this good work to others, but knowing their zeal I had preferred addressing myself to them. They listened to me with pleasure and on the spot the matter was settled. The owner of the land was willing to make some sacrifice, and he sold it at a very reasonable price; moreover, that he also might have a hand in the

good work he gratuitously gave an eighth part of the land. When Monseigneur arrived he built a seminary on the ground and placed in charge of it the Lazarists, who had come from Rome to work on the mission.

When it became known that I was a member of the community the Catholics came from twelve to fifteen leagues to Mass. Because for the most part they were English and I was the only priest in that neighborhood who knew a little of their language. Several families located a dozen leagues away on the banks of the Mississippi and particularly showed their zeal in this regard. I could not behold without compassion how their desire for salvation made them subject themselves to such great fatigue.

An infirm mother of one of these families who was unable to walk begged me urgently to come to her and bring her consolation. I promised to visit her provided some one accompanied me as the way was both dangerous and difficult. It led through some woods where tigers, bears and large snakes were at large. Moreover, just half way there was a village of fierce natives not less dangerous than the wild beasts. She sent me one of her sons who knew the different by-paths perfectly and who conducted me without accident. I was received as an angel from heaven. I said Mass on the three days following at this mission. Seeing that there were several Catholics there and that many of the Protestants would attend there, I set about organizing a congregation which I visited four times a year. The Protestants came to see me and many of them renounced their error, as did also many of the negroes of the region.

Several of the young women of this new congregation joined the Ladies of the Sacred Heart who had just settled nearby and who were doing great good there. It is always a matter of astonishment to see persons of the

fair sex, tender and delicate, face the perils of the sea, brave the dangers of a wild country and expose themselves to the ferocity of wild beasts which are met in all parts here, in order to contribute to the salvation of souls. Verily, it is only the true religion that can inspire such courage!

But continuing my narrative in the order of time, I come now to speak of a village called Dardine.¹ The good people there having come to seek assistance for one of their sick urged me with such insistence not to abandon them that I could not refuse; but I took advantage of the occasion to propose to them that they build a church. I had hardly spoken, when they cried out in one voice: "We very much wish it; it is our one desire!" They began the following day with so much ardor to prepare the materials for building that it was finished in short order. What a misfortune not to be able to send priests to those who are so well disposed towards religion!

There occurred in one of my parishes an incident extraordinary enough to find place here. Two brothers, one an atheist and the other an Anabaptist, were converted to the Faith and I baptized them after they had renounced their error. When their father, who lived on the banks of the Ohio, heard the news he was grieved to the heart. Although at a distance of a hundred and fifty leagues he immediately set out to visit them in the hope of winning back his two sons or rather perverting them. First he had recourse to mildness; but seeing that that gained him nothing he resorted to threats. All was useless. Their faith triumphed and the two young men remained unshaken. Besides these two boys he also had a daughter whom I had had instructed by a pious

¹ Probably Darden of Tennessee.

woman who took all possible pains with her. When she was sufficiently prepared she received Baptism, one of her brothers acting as godfather. The affair could not be kept so quiet that her father did not hear of it. He was wild with rage, but disguising his anger he went in quest of his daughter who was living with her brothers, and said to her with feigned gentleness:

"My daughter, I have need of you. You must come with me."

The girl obeyed. The two brothers, knowing his violent mood and fearing what he might do, followed at a distance unobserved. When he had reached home with his daughter the father said:

"My child, you have turned Catholic, I understand?"

"Yes, father," she answered.

"Very well," he replied, "you will not be one long."

So saying he seized a club and raising it above the head of the innocent child he was about to murder her when the two brothers who had been listening at the door suddenly entered. He was so surprised to see them that he dropped the stick, crying: "I am lost." The brothers took their sister away from their father's house. The unfortunate and cruel father in despair at seeing his children Catholics, separated himself from them and never again rejoined them.

Besides caring for the white people and the sick, I often had the good fortune of instructing the Indians, men and women, in order to prepare them for Baptism. These simple souls never lost one word that was said to them. They were very exact in confessing, and most attentive to instructions. The women especially showed great zeal and never let pass any occasion for exercising it; they showed this by procuring baptism for their little ones. One day in the parish of St. Charles, while baptising a large number of children, an old Indian woman laid at my feet one of these little natives and said:

“Pour water on this child. His father wishes to kill him. There is not a moment to spare.” His father had, in fact, (the natives never say “you” but always “thee”) already placed him on the sands by the banks of the Missouri and was about to rush upon him with his tomahawk, (the tomahawk is a little hatchet which the Indians throw some distance with astonishing dexterity without missing their aim), when the woman snatched up the child and bore him off to me. I baptized him and confided him to the care of his godfather and god-mother.

At the beginning of the war which the Americans waged with the Indians for a period of six or seven years, a Catholic of the Iroquois tribe, about thirty years of age, came to St. Charles from Missouri. One day a very bad American called to him, and shot him with a pistol. The poor Indian, realizing that the bullet had passed through him, knew he would die; but instead of seeking vengeance on his assailant, humbled himself before God, asked forgiveness for his sins and heartily pardoned for the love of God the treacherous enemy who caused his death. This is admirable in a native, for their dominant passion is revenge.

When peace had been re-established I made a visit to an Indian mission at a distance of three hundred leagues. I had not dared to undertake so long and so dangerous a voyage during the war, because although I could not help but wander around a certain distance to visit my other missions and attend to the sick, I did not deem it right to expose myself too often to the mercy of the Indian warriors, who lay in abuscade at night near the villages to “scalp” any one they caught. I should here explain what is meant by the word “scalp.” When a savage has killed a white man he cuts the skin round the head in the form of a crown; holding the hair in

one hand, he kicks the dead man in the stomach and so tears off skin and hair. This they call scalping. When they have a certain number of scalps they go down to their village to dance the scalp dance, relating in their own way how they got each particular scalp, the nationality of each, and its history. This is their way of proving their courage and winning distinction.

Constantly people came to tell me that the Indians had attacked such and such a place; one was killed working in the fields; another on a voyage; others again were slain in their beds. One scarcely speaks of anything except such misfortunes. One day they killed five of my parishioners during vespers. Amidst these dangers the French were less exposed than the Americans; for the Indians were at war with the latter only, on account of taking their land. Consequently they said to the French: "Live always as you have been accustomed to live in order that we can distinguish you from the great *Couteaux*¹ (as they call the Americans). When they captured Americans they treated them very cruelly; and if they spared them for the moment it was to put them to death by slow torture and to feed upon their flesh.

One day two Americans fell into their hands, and lest they might escape they brought them to a savage village. While their fate was being decided they were laid on their backs on the earth; then their four extremities were stretched out fastened to four pegs driven very deep into the ground. One was condemned to be boiled in a large kettle and afterwards eaten; the other was to be roasted alive before the fire over which the pot was boiling which contained his companion. The first, having been disembowelled was pulled to pieces and crammed into the kettle;

¹ This word can perhaps best be translated by bowie-knives. It represents a figure of speech peculiar to the Indian.

the other was stripped of his clothes and led before the fire from which the flames rose more than six feet. The Indians, weapons in hand, formed a circle round him that he might not escape. The women were in front, each holding in her hand a pointed stick with which to prod the unfortunate man and to oblige him to turn towards the fire. It is worthy of note that under such circumstances the women are far more cruel than the men. One of these women had her child in her arms. She was the most vicious of all. The poor creature who was thus roasting, unable to bear such cruel torture conceived the idea of making them kill him at once; and for this purpose grabbed her child and flung it in the pot with his companion. Seeing this, the savages clapping their hands to their mouths, cried out: "He is a hero! He is a hero!" and the mother of the child coming forward adopted him as her son; in this way he was spared; but on condition that he recognize as his mother her whose child he had thrown into the pot. One need not be astonished at this, for it is the custom among these people for the woman to adopt as her husband or son him who has been the murderer, if he is caught. This is the almost invariable rule.

There are, however, among these natives, some white men more inhuman than the aborigines. The following story gives one instance of this. One day two young American girls about eighteen years of age fell into the hands of some Indians who carried them off to their camp. It is easier to imagine than to describe what was the fright and shock of these girls at the sight of these wild men, thirsty for blood and always ready to shed it. However, whether they were moved by the tears of these two unfortunates or whether they were induced by some prospective interest, they decided to sell them to some white traders. While awaiting the arrival of the mer-

chants who must have been at some distance, they placed the two young women by the side of a fire. There they kept them, trembling from head to foot, more dead than alive, when a white man living among the natives approached one of them with a knife in his hand; and having laid her breast bare with violence, cut it off and roasted it. The natives were horrified at such barbarity; they pursued the monster to kill him, but he hid himself. Meanwhile the poor victim of so horrible a deed was stretched on the ground bathed in her own blood and overcast with the pallor of death. A savage, bending over her said: "My poor girl, we did not wish to kill thee, but since thou has lost so much blood and cannot escape death, I will do thee a kindness." With these words he cleaved the head from the body with his hatchet. A merchant bought the other and returned her to her parents. I learned this tragic story from those who were themselves spectators of it.

One need not be astonished to hear this savage announce as an act of charity his resolve to break the neck of the poor girl. The Indians would behave in exactly the same manner toward their own relatives, for a native who has an infirm father or mother takes great care of them while he lives in the same place with them, but when he is far removed from them he says to his father or to his mother, sometimes to both of them:

"Behold, ye are no longer good for anything; I am going away and ye could not follow me; What will you do here? You will have a great deal to suffer; therefore I will do you a kindness and kill you." When they are dead he wraps them in dry bark, binds it with straps of hide or other strings; he buries them in the fork of a tree which they call laying in *achipaille*.¹

¹What the meaning of this word may be has not been determined. There is a French word *hache-paille* which means straw-cutting machine.

There are very many curious things to tell about Indian customs; but it is time to go back where I left off. I wish to speak of the voyage I undertook to visit a settlement three hundred leagues distant, where up until that time there had never been a priest. It was situated farther up than the Wisconsin, on the left bank of the Mississippi. It took me thirty-four days to reach it. I set out in the beginning of March, 1817, accompanied by six men, of whom five were for rowing and one for steering the canoe. I had bargained to pay each one hundred and ten francs a month; for they would have many difficulties to overcome. Not only were winds quite frequent, but the cold was extreme and caused us much suffering. Hardly had we set out when snow covered the earth anew. The ice which had formed along the river came near ending our trip. The oars scarcely touched the water when they were laden with ice. We were several days in one place without being able to make any progress. When we were about a hundred leagues up the river we came to rapids nearly six leagues long; we ascended them with great difficulty and not without danger of perishing. Every evening when we had put to land to pass the night the savages came to visit us; after they had gotten warmed up a little the chief came and gave me his hand, as did also the leaders among them. I flung them a roll of tobacco to mollify them as they still were dangerous although peace had been made.

The thirty-fourth day from the time of my departure after great fatigue and hardships we reached the place to which we sought to carry the light of faith. I was heartily welcomed by the people who had invited me to pay them this visit. The Commander of the fort although a Protestant, honored me with a visit and offered me his services. I lived one month among these people who,

until then, had been entirely abandoned. I administered holy Baptism to a great many, large and small, among whom there were many half-breeds and savages. In short, all day I was occupied in the exercise of the holy ministry. Three persons only refused to profit by my visit. Protestants came every day to the instructions; even the Jews were converted. The savages of different nations were exact in attendance at Mass; the savage women brought me their children in groups, some to be baptized, others that they might behold a Makita Courage; that is to say, a black-robe who speaks to the Master of Life it is thus they call the priest. I will say in a word that God blessed my work (notwithstanding my unworthiness) far beyond what I had hoped for.

As the Councils of the savages were held in the house in which I lived the commander invited me to attend. They took place immediately after dinner; I went several times and remained a few minutes. On entering the Council chamber we found it filled with savages some of whom were seated on benches, others on the ground; others stood around with their long calumets (long pipes) in their hands. When all had come in he who was to speak to the white men spread a carpet made of skins of weasles or of otter or of beaver, this was done in profound silence. During all of this time the savages kept their heads bowed down nearly to their knees. Everything having been prepared, one of the chiefs filled the pipe with tobacco; then he struck a light with a flint; finally having placed on the pipe a bit of lighted amadon (German tinder) he offered it to the great chief, who drew the smoke with vigor until the tobacco had well taken fire. Then he offered the pipe to the President of the Council, immediately thereafter to all the white men, and then to the savages. If any one refused to smoke, it was a sign that he had bad feelings, that is

to say, that he was not content and desired to do evil. After this odd ceremony the big chief, a quiver full of arrows behind his left shoulder, and his bow and his pipe in his right hand, coming before the President spoke to him in this fashion:

“When we had our French father (that is the way they always describe the King of France whom they ever lament) he left us entirely free and enriched us with presents which made us greatly love him. Ye others, the great Couteaux (for it was thus they called the Americans) hardly had ye set foot on our lands than ye drove us away. Thou seest, my father, we were formerly on the shores of a great lake (the ocean); today we are far from it. Nevertheless, all these lands which thou hast taken away from us we had been given by the Master of Life” (as he said this he lifted his hands towards heaven); “there is scarcely anything more to hunt. When we have no more animals to kill, with what will we nourish our wives and children? Behold my young people who are dissatisfied,” (pointing to the warriors sitting about in silence); “If ye cease not to take our lands they will kill as many of the rest of ye as they can. But listen, my father, as they are pressed with hunger, if thou wilt give them to eat and then a little strong water (brandy) they will be pleased with thee. They want also powder and shot. Give them these, my father, and they will not kill but love thee.” At this all applauded.

When he had finished his speech he placed his right hand on his hip and remained silent. The President, after answering in a few words, had some food, brandy, powder and some shells distributed among them. Then the savages departed for Roche-Jaune which is about four leagues farther up on the banks of the Mississippi, where they lived as long as the provisions lasted. One

does not permit them to drink while they are among the white men because they are so brutal when drunk that they make sport of killing each other and the white men are also much exposed to receive injury. I have already given examples of their ferocity, but I will give still another before ending.

One day when again going up the Mississippi I arrived with my canoe and the men who accompanied me near a house which the savages had set afire and where some horrible cruelties had been committed. The father and mother whom they had scalped were lying dead before the door. Besides this they had massacred seven children, most of them girls. The largest one they had put on the hearth of the chimney to serve as a log; two they had placed as andirons, two above crosswise and the two smallest in a kettle in which some one was making soap. The house was on fire when we arrived. I shuddered with fear lest the savages might still be there but a domesticated savage who accompanied me reassured me by saying that from what they had done on a similar occasion it was safe to assume that they had promptly withdrawn.

With much confusion, I reviewed this burning house and the bloody corpses when a sight sadder still, at least more apt to excite pity, caught my eye. A poor old man nearly sixty-five years of age came before me having been scalped and left for dead by the savages. "Father Joseph," he said to me, "Save my soul! save my soul!" (speaking in the English language). We took all possible care of him and he became some better, but at the end of a few days he died.

Whilst speaking of the barbarity of these savages and their manner of holding councils I feel that I would have omitted something if I did not mention their meals which they call *festins*. Ordinarily they invite the white

men who come to their country to buy skins, especially when marrying off their children. This is how they do! When a young man goes to wed a girl, the pledges having been given, the two families meet together to partake of a friendship feast; if white men are at hand they are invited to the banquet. When everything is ready they seat themselves on the ground around the fire where the messes are prepared. The circle is of a size in proportion to the number of people present. The cooks are in the centre. They cut the food in pieces so as to distribute to each individually: They serve it in large morsels and they serve as many times as there are dishes. Each one makes his knees serve him for a table and there is given to every one a piece of flat wood or bark of a tree to use as a plate. They all have knives; there are no forks or glasses. In the middle of the circle they have a vessel filled with water. When everybody has been served they begin to eat. The rule to be observed at these banquets is that one must eat all that is served. In as much as the white men eat much less than the savages they make big eaters sit on each side of them to whom they give a part of the food that is served them, but unknown to the savagesses who serve, for if these would discover that they did not eat all they would be offended. There is no bread; the dishes consist of meats of wild cattle, roebuck, bears, game of all kinds, etc. Dog meat is the most sought after among all the savage tribes of Missouri and Mississippi. All meats are boiled or roasted on the end of a pointed piece of wood driven in the ground before the fire. When they have fish they roast it on burning coals.

They have no other ceremonies. They all are very joyous during the feast at the end of which the young married man goes to live with the father of his espoused where he remains for the next three years as son-in-law.

All the peltry that he gets during that time goes to his father-in-law unless he has some horses to give him in return for the hand of his daughter. At the end of three years he severs the tie and begins to work for himself.

I want to relate, before closing, an event which I have not seen but which I have from several old gentlemen of one of my parishes who have told it to me, having been themselves eye-witnesses and having dug with their own hands the grave wherein the priest whom it concerns was buried. His story has something so interesting and at the same time so marvellous about it that I cannot resist inserting it here.

He had come in his youth among the savages to endeavor to convert them. He settled near those living on the shore of Lake Michigan and other lakes which are in the neighborhood, where he exercised his ministry with zeal and perseverance up until an advanced age without them doing him any harm. They loved and respected him as their father but in the end this love was thought to be his ruin. This is how the thing happened. One day the savages said to him: "O my father, thou art very good. It is a long time that thou hast been with us. Thou hast done us so much good; we love thee so much we would wish to eat thee."

This good priest was not ignorant of the fact that these savages meant just what they said and they would really eat him, because when a savage said a thing like that he always did it. He therefore said to them:—

"But if you eat me, my children, you will no longer have me. You must not eat me, therefore, if you wish me to remain with you longer."

"That is true, father," they replied, "but we love thee so much that we want to eat thee."

The priest, seeing himself exposed to such an unlucky end, did not consider it wise to remain longer amongst

them, persuaded that, sooner or later, they would satisfy their craving. He answered them, "Wait until the next moon and if then you still desire it, you may eat me."

He set out immediately in a bark canoe for Canada or St. Joseph in order to escape the threatened misfortune. These canoes are made of the bark called birch. One passes by means of them over lakes of two or three hundred leagues in size. There are canoes of this kind large enough to carry ten thousand pounds. They resist the waves much better than large boats. This birch canoe belonged to a fur trader to whom the priest had told his story and who said to him :

"You are no longer in safety; they will do as they have said. Come with me."

When they had arrived at a certain place where they slept they put their canoes in a brook to escape the fury of the waves; and after the rowers had taken a little rest the priest called two of them and having conducted them a short distance away he said to them: "Dig here a grave and to-morrow morning before setting out wrap me in my mantle and bury me here." The rowers, seeing that he was in good health, believed that this was imagination. "Put away this vagary of the mind," they said to him, "you will not die so soon." "Do not doubt me," he replied, "to-morrow I will be dead. God has made it known to me. Promise to bury me in this grave." It happened according to his prediction. The next day they found him dead and they fulfilled their promise. Immediately after he had been buried the river on whose bank was his grave changed its course and formed a channel higher than the grave through which to find its way into the lake.

When it was learned in Canada that death had overtaken this saintly priest and the prediction which had preceded it became known, orders were given to exhume

the body in order that his remains might be properly cared for; but no one could find the place of burial. Ever since that time they called this river the "River of Father Marquette;" which was the name of this worthy priest. I have all this from the lips of those who themselves had been witnesses of the event. They have related it to me more than fifty times with an interest and reverence for the priest which fully proved that the occurrence was real and that the persons who told me did not imagine it.

NOTE: One must recognize that these narratives¹ were not written to be printed, in as much as they have neither elegance nor precision; but only the stories of two good Religious who opened their heart with confidence and without restraint to a Superior who loved them; and consequently one must not be astonished at the faults which one finds against the rules and niceties of the French language.

NOTICE: All persons who desire to contribute to this good work of the civilization and conversion of the natives should address their donations to "M. M. Les Curés de St. Sulpice de St. Roche et de la Madeleine" or to "M. Chapelière, Notaire, Rue de La Lixeranderie. Vis à vis la Rue du Mouton," or better still to the Rev. P. Abbé de La Trappe, himself at the monastery of La Trappe, par Mortagne, Department de l'Orme. Printing press of de Queffier, Rue Quenegand, No. 31.

¹ One of the narratives, that of Father Vincent de Paul, is not printed here.

FATHER PETER HELBRON'S GREENSBURG PA. REGISTER

Continued

Copied from the original book by Rev. Father John, O. S. B., of Saint Vincent's Abbey, Pennsylvania. Translated by Lawrence F. Flick, M. D., LL. D.

REGISTER OF BAPTISMS FOR 1803.

Hendell, Salome, of Daniel and Catharine Hendell, born December 2nd, baptized February 13th. Sponsors, Bridget O' Donnell and Henry Kuhn.

Original book, page 20.

Flouer, Henry, of Henry and Margaret Flouer (date of birth not given), baptized March 16th. Sponsors, Joseph Flouer and his wife.

Flouer, Joseph, of Joseph and Catharine Flouer (date of birth not given), baptized March 16. Sponsors, Henry Flouer and his wife.

Flouer, Thomas and Margaret, of Thomas and Elizabeth Flouer (date of birth not given), baptized March 16th. Sponsors, Joseph Flouer and his wife.

O'Bryen, [O'Brien?] Mary Susan and Rose, of Daniel and Mary O'Bryen (date of birth not given), baptized March 16th. Sponsors, relatives whose names are not known. (Whilst the word "ignota" is used, the meaning evidently is "have been forgotten.")

Keyl, [Kyle?] Catharine, of Philip and Catharine Keyl, born October 12th, (evidently of preceding year), baptized March 26th. Sponsors, Andrew and Catharine Champbell [Campbell?].

Cannovy, Samuel, of Samuel and Patience Cannovy, born December 21st, (evidently of preceding year), baptized March 26th. Sponsors, Michael and Margaret Champbell [Campbell?] unmarried.

Isly, [Easly?] Elizabeth, of Andrew and Elizabeth Isly, born March 17th, baptized April 10th. Sponsors, Henry Kuhn and his sister Mary.

Zindorff, Peter, of George and Anna Mary Zindorff, born October 12th (evidently of preceding year), baptized April 24. Sponsors, John Noele and Mary Kuhn.

Original book, page 21.

Lochler, Jacob, of John and Margaret Lochler, born May 1st, 18c2, baptized May 3rd. Sponsors, James Meckfall [McFaul?] and Helen Lory [Lowry?].

- Weith, [White?] Susan, of Joseph and Mary Weith, born December 18th, 1802, baptized May 3rd. Sponsors, John Lochley and Catharine Meckfall [McFaul?].
- Yeaman, Jacob, of Jacob and Helen Yeaman (date of birth not, given), baptized May 3rd. Sponsors, Patrick Brannen and Mary Morphy [Murphy?].
- Hammell, Catharine, of Patrick and Mary Hammell, born May 30th, 1802, baptized May 3rd. Sponsors, Michael and Elizabeth Martinimy.
- Numen [Newman?], Mary Ann, of Peter and Margaret Numen, ten years old, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, Patrick and Mary Numen.
- Lery [Leary?], Helen, of William and Mary Lery, four years old, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, John Meckfall [McFaul?] and Julia Carder [Carter?].
- Schleth, Edward, of Daniel and Margaret Schleth, born May 2nd, 1802, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, Anthony Kelly and Margaret Numen [Newman?].
- Braun, [Brown?], George, of James and Frances Braun, born July 16th, 1802, baptized May 9th. Sponsors, James Dageurthy [Dougherty?] and Rose Mantecka.
- Dageurthy [Dougherty?], Sara, of William and Margaret Dageurthy, born April 6, 1802, baptized May 9th. Sponsors, John Cannedy [Kennedy?] and Margaret Finck.
- Thernan [Tiernan?], Mary, of Patrick and Margaret Thernan, born August 9th, 1802, baptized May 15th. Sponsors, Amund Borne and Susan Gelaspy [Gillespie?].
- Kühn, Elizabeth, of John and Mary Kühn, born December 6th, 1803, (evidently a mistake for 1802) baptized May 15th. Sponsors, John Mollery [Mulherin?] and Margaret his wife.
- Dageurthy [Dougherty?], John, of James and Catharine Dageurthy, born January 12th, baptized May 15th. Sponsors, John Dageurthy and Susan.
- Delany, Mary Ann, of Dionysius and Margaret Delany, born February 27th, 1802, baptized May 15th. Sponsors, John Meclany [McIlhenny?] and Mary Dagourthy [Dougherty?].

Original book, page 22.

- Meckerr [McGirr?], William, of John and Petronilla Meckerr, born October 22nd (evidently of preceding year), baptized May 15th. Sponsors, Patrick Lies and Margaret Delany.
- Gelaspy [Gillespie?], John, of James and Mary Gelaspy, born February 17th, 1802, baptized May 16th. Sponsors, Patrick and Margaret Thernan [Tiernan?].
- Gelaspy [Gillespie?], Elizabeth, of James and Mary Gelaspy, born January 6th, 1800, baptized May 16th. Sponsors, Michael Thernan [Tiernan?] and Susan Gelaspy.

- Meccshery [McSherry?] Bartholomew, of Angus and Isabel Meccshery, born November 22nd 1802, baptized May 16th. Sponsors, Bartholomew Meccshery and Mary Thernan [Tiernan?].
- Therrens [Torrance?] Charles, of Michael and Elizabeth Therrens, born April 13, 1803, baptized May 16th. Sponsors, John and Margaret Dagourthy [Dougherty?].
- Beckery, Mary Susan, of ——— Beckery (Christian name of father not given) and Frances his wife, of no religion, sixteen years old, baptized May 22nd. Sponsor, Prudence Derbyn [Durbin?].
- Beyl, [Boyle?] Genevieve, of Daniel and Genevieve Beyl, born May 1st, 1803, baptized May 22nd. Sponsors, Charles and Catharine Harken.
- Galegar [Gallagher?] Margaret, of Anthony and Bridget Galegar, born February 20th, 1802, baptized May 22nd. Sponsors, Patrick Beyl [Boyle?] and Elizabeth Meckuy [McHugh?].
- Car [Carr?] Bridget, of Charles and Mary Ann Car, born February 15, 1802, baptized May 22nd. Sponsors, Dionysius and Catharine Dugen [Dugan?].
- Galegar [Gallagher?] Mary, of John and Mary Galegar, born March 22, 1803, baptized May 22nd. Sponsors, Bernard Harken and Petronilla Dugen [Dugan?].
- Easten [Easton?] Mary, of George and Barbara Easten, twelve years old, baptized May 22nd, sponsors, Nicholas Meclansy and Elizabeth Singery.
- Singery, Jacob, of Thomas and Elizabeth Singery, six years old, baptized May 22nd. Sponsors, Nicholas Meclansy. (The plural word sponsors is used, but only one sponsor is given.)
- Singery, Thomas, of Thomas and Elizabeth Singery, three years old, baptized May 22nd. Sponsors, Julius Beyl [Boyle?] and Catharine Galeghar [Gallagher?]

Original book, page 23.

- Fincher, Charles, of Thomas and Elizabeth Fincher, born September 6th, baptized May 22nd. Sponsors, Michael Meckuy [McHugh?] and Mary Harken.
- Brick, George, of Peter and Margaret Brick, born April 22nd, baptized May 29th. Sponsors, George and Anna Mary Ruffner.
- Seyvert [Seybert?] John, of Philip and Mary Seyvert, born April 19th, baptized May 29th. Sponsors, Thomas and Elizabeth Aaron [Ahern?]
- Adschar, Peter, of John and Elizabeth Adschar, five years old, baptized May 29th. Sponsors, Peter Koss and Theresa Brick.
- Griffy [Greavy?] George, of Henry and Magdalen Griffy, born April 28th, baptized June 12th. Sponsors, Joseph Noel and Mary Ruffner, maiden.

Ruffner . . . (no christian name of Child given) daughter of George and Sybilla Ruffner, born May 8th, baptized June 12th. Sponsors, George and Elizabeth Ruffner.

Schorthy, Bridget, of Juy and Elizabeth Schorthy, born April 20th, baptized June 12th. Sponsors, Peter Rogers and Catharine his wife.

—, (no surname given) Peter, thirteen years old, deserted by parents, baptized August 28th. Sponsors, John and Martha Mecavy.

Original book, page 24.

Isly [Easly?] Peter Ferdinand, of Ferdinand and Margaret Isly, born July 31st, baptized August 28th. Sponsors, Christian and Magdalen Ruffner.

Merckell, [Markle?] John, of John and Barbara Merckell, born September 7th, baptized October 9th. Sponsors, Jacob Kuhn and Mary Henry, maiden.

(After this entry is inserted a note) "In a visit made to all the stations in the new territory on the other side of the Allegeny [Allegheny] and Monocohely [Monongahela] Rivers."

McKellway, Anna, of Patrick and Anna McKellway, born August 17th, baptized October 11th. Sponsors, John and Margaret Schmidt.

Dagourthy, [Dougherty?] Sara, of Patrick and Ann Dagourthy (date of birth is not given), baptized October 11th. Sponsors, Patrick McKellway and his daughter Margaret.

Meckderrly, Anna, of Cornelius and Mary Meckderrly, one year old, baptized October 12th. Sponsors, Patrick Ferry and Bridget Meckbraid [McBride?].

Meckbraid [McBride] Bridget, of Patrick and Bridget Meckbraid, born April 3rd, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Cornelius and Mary Meckerry.

Kohl, Jacob, of Peter and Catharine Kohl, born February 27, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Juy and Elizabeth Schorthy.

Lill [Lilly?] Frank, of James and Elizabeth Lill, born March 25th, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Peter and Catharine Kohl.

Begen, John, of Patrick and Margaret Begen, born June 30th, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, James and Elizabeth Lill [Lilly?].

Meckelly, Bridget, of William and Catharine Meckelly, born December 8th, (no doubt of the preceding year), baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Gelaspy and his wife. [Gillespie?]

Roger, Peter, of Jonas and Cecilia Roger, born February 5th, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, John and Catharine Morren.

Original book, page 25.

Carry [Carey?] Joseph of Michael and Margaret Carry, born December 29th (no doubt of preceding year), baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Joseph Morren and Judith Kelly.

Meckenolly, [McAnally?] Julius, of Patrick and Mary Meckenolly,

- born December 20th (evidently of preceding year), baptized October 16th. Sponsors, James Morren and Catharine Meckenolly.
- Schorthy, Mary of Anthony and Bridget Schorthy, born March 28th, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, John and Anna Wellreck.
- Kreen, [Green?] Catharine, of James and Genevieve Kreen, born March 22, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Bridget and Anthony Schorthy.
- Meckuy [McHugh?] Rose, of Joseph and Mary Meckuy, born September 27th, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Edward and Judith Kohl.
- Meckenelly, [McAnally?] George, of — (Christian name of father not given) and Mary Meckenelly, born — 27th (month not given), baptized October 16th. Sponsors, John and Margaret Schmidt.
- Schmidt, Catharine, of John and Margaret Schmidt, born June 14th, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Michael and Mary Welsch.
- Grahn [Graham?] Sara, of James and Genevieve Graham, born May 14th, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Edward and Margaret Meckferry.

(Note here states). All of those just going before were baptized at Schlypery [Slippery?] Rock.

- Rogers, Bernard, of Cornelius and Anne Rogers, born April 18, 1802, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, John Dugen [Dugan?] and Catharine Forker [Foraker?].
- Forker [Foraker?] Bridget, of John and Rose Forker, born May 18, baptized October 22. Sponsors, Cornelius O'Donnel and Bridget Dugen [Dugan?].
- Heyl, August, of John and Elizabeth Heyl, born in 1803 (month not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Cornelius and Ann Roger.
- Meclachlen [McLaughlin?] James, of Patrick and Anne Meclachlen, born March 4, 1803, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Thomas and Elizabeth Dugen [Dugan?]
- Gelaspy [Gillespie?] Manasses, of John and Othelia Gelaspy, born August 15th, 1802, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Daniel O'Donnell and Petronilla Kohl.

Original book, page 26.

- Anderson, Isaac, of Joseph and Mary Anderson, born May 10, 1803, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Charles and Catharine Schwiny [Sweeney?].
- Black, John, of Archibald and Regina Black (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Morrall Meclansy and Treys.
- Quinn, Daniel, of Joseph and Catharine Quinn, born August 15th, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Daniel and Bridget Reed.

- Doffy [Duffy?] Barnaby, of John and Sophia Doffy, born September 11th, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, John and Anna Caleghar [Gallagher?].
- Doffy, [Duffy?] Petronilla, of John and Anna Doffy (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Peter and Catharine Dagourthy. [Dougherty?]
- Dogourthy [Dougherty?] Anna, of Peter and Anna Dogourthy (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, John and Anna Doffy. [Duffy?]
- Meckuy [McHugh?] Bridget, of Daniel and Bridget Meckuy, born February 6th, 1802. baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, James and Bridget Meckuy [McHugh?]
- McKirley, Catharine, of— (Christian name of father not given) and Bridget McKirley, born May 1st, 1803, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Daniel and Bridget Meckuy [McHugh?]
- Meckbraid, [McBride?] Margaret, of John and Mary Meckbraid, born May 15th, 1803, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, John and Margaret McBraid.
- Meclay, John, of William and Catharine Meclay, born July 17th, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, John and Margaret McKirly.
- Dorry [Derry?] Salome, of John and Rose Dorry, born March 30th, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Peter and Mary McBraid [McBride?].
- McBraid [McBride?] Henry, of Patrick and Mary McBraid, born April 12th, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Manasses Dugen [Dugan?] and Catharine Dorry [Derry?].
- Meckferrly, Edward, of Edward and Anna Meckferrly, born July 27th, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Edward and Catharine McKirly.
- Kelly, Frank, of Bernard and Bridget Kelly, born March 12th, 1802, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Peter and Sophie Farren.
- Griffy [Greavy?] George, of John and Mary Griffy, born July 31st, 1803, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Philip and Margaret Hartman.

Original book, page 27.

- Haegen [Hagen?], James, of Andrew and Margaret Haegen, born September 3rd, 1802, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Michael and Mary Keely.
- Meckferring, Charles, of Edward and Mary Meckferring, born May 18th, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Philip, Meckelrey [McElroy?] and Catharine Green.
- Meckohl [McCall?], Elizabeth, of James and Petronilla Meckohl, born April 22, 1801, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Terence and Elizabeth McKohl.
- Mecherrikell [McGarrigle?], Anna, of James and Anna Mecherrikell,

born April 22nd, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Patrick and Meckellfy [McKelvey?].

O'Donnell, Sara, of . . . (christian name of father not given) and Mary O'Donnell, born February 7th, baptized October 22. Sponsors, John and Anna Meclachlen [McLaughlin?].

Doffy [Duffy?], Michael, of Charles and Nellie Doffy (date of birth not given), baptized October 22. Sponsors, Michael and Margaret Dugen [Dugan?].

Calaghar [Gallagher?], William, of William and Petronilla Calaghar (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Patrick Calaghar and Petronilla O'Donnel.

Christy, Peter, of Archibald and Mary Christy, born July 17, 1802, baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Andrew and Susan Dugen [Dugan?].

Ferry, John, of Edward and Margaret Ferry (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Archibald and Mary Christy.

Dugen [Dugan?], Dionysius, of James and Mary Dugen (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, James Schordy and Mary Dorry [Derry?].

Collenz, [Collins?], John, of William and Julia Collenz (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Patrick Lafferty and Elizabeth Harger.

Merhy [Murray?], Bernard, of John and Cecelia Merhy (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Edward and Mary Ferry.

Original book, page 28.

Collenz [Collins?], Charles, of William and Julia Collenz (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Michael and Theresa Dugen? [Dugan?].

Hargen, Juy, of Robert and Elizabeth Hargen (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Michael and Barbara Doffy [Duffy?].

Collenz [Collins?], William, of William and Julia Collenz (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Bernard Kely [Kelly?] and Petronilla Calaghar [Gallagher?].

Preys, [Preuss?], Genevieve, of Richard and Theresa Preys (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Edward Dagourthy [Dougherty?] and Catharine McBraid [McBride?].

—, Thomas, (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, Julius and Julia Mackelrey [McElroy?].

Harkin, Catharine, of Robert and Mary Harkin (date of birth not given), baptized October 22nd. Sponsors, John and Rose Forker [Foraker?].

[Note] all of the above were baptized in Boofflo [Buffalo?].

Meckelway, Catharine, of Michael and Elizabeth Meckelway (date of birth not given), baptized November 6th. Sponsors, Patrick Brannen and Martha McKuy [McHugh?].

- Numan [Newman?], Petronilla, of Patrick and Eleanor Numan, (date of birth not given), baptized November 6th. Sponsors, Dionysius Morphy [Murphy?] and Catharine McKall [McCall?].
- Michen [Meehan?], Genevieve, of James and Mary Michen, (date of birth not given), baptized November 6th. Sponsors, John Brannen and Anna Braun [Brown?].
- Michen [Meehan?], William, of James and Mary Michen (date of birth not given), baptized November 6th. (The word sponsors is omitted), Daniel and Eleanor Lachel.
- Mecady, Mary, of Edward and Elizabeth Mecady, (date of birth not given), baptized November 6th. Sponsors, David and Elizabeth Dorby [Durby?].
- Braun [Brown?], Anne, of John and Anna Braun, (date of birth not given), baptized November 6th. Sponsors, Christopher and Catharine Braun.
- Branen [Brannen?], Salome, of John and Anna Branen (date of birth not given), baptized November 6th. Sponsors, James Brannen and Mary Clany.

Original book, page 29.

- Müller, Elizabeth, of Jacob and Sara Müller (date of birth not given), baptized November 6th. Sponsors, Dionysius and Unita Denny.
- Cany [Kenny?], Helen, of James and Margaret Cany (date of birth not given), baptized November 7th. Sponsors, Anthony Kelly and Helen Nummen [Newman?].
- Gud, [Good?] Mary, of Balthasar and Rose Gud, (date of birth not given) baptized, November 7th, (the word sponsors is omitted) Morgen Born and Mary Nummen [Newman?].
- Gud [Good?] Frank, of Balthasar and Rose Gud, (date of birth not given), baptized November 7th. Sponsors, Moyse Born and Mary Kelly.
- Caleghar [Gallagher?] Jovita, of Michael and Margaret Caleghar (date of birth not given), baptized November 14th. Sponsors, James and Frances Braun [Brown?].
- Waith [White?] of James and Elizabeth Waith (date of birth not given), baptized November 14th. Sponsors, Michael Caleghar [Gallagher?] and Elizabeth Waith.
- Workman, Elizabeth, of Jacob and Mary Workman (date of birth not given), baptized November 20th. Sponsors, Nicholas and Margaret Gelaspy [Gillespie?].
- Meckfuy [McVey?] Margaret, of Patrick and Anna Meckfuy (date of birth not given), baptized November 20th. Sponsors Jacob and Ann Leaden.
- Leaden, Anna, of Jacob and Anna Leaden (date of birth not given), baptized November 20th. Sponsors, Patrick and Anna Morphy [Murphy?].

Chartery, Helen, of Daniel and Helen Chartery (date of birth not given), baptized November 20th. Sponsors, John Kuhn and Cecilia Realy [Rahilly?].

Mcgady, Mary, of Patrick and Elizabeth Mcgady, (date of birth not given) baptized November 20th. Sponsors, Patrick Goenen [Gannon?] and Catharine Donnely.

Realy [Rahilly?] Elizabeth, of James and Elizabeth Realy (date of birth not given), baptized November 20th. Sponsors, Thomas Kuhn and Salome Guy.

Dagourthy [Dougherty?] Patrick, of John and Susan Dagourthy (date of birth not given), baptized November 20th. Sponsors, James and Anna Dagourthy.

Original book, page 30,

Collman [Coleman?] Anna, of John and Mary Collman (date of birth not given), baptized November 20th. Sponsors, Jacob and Ann Gramenich.

Lily [Lilly?] Nicholas, of George and Elizabeth Lily (date of birth not given), baptized November 20th. Sponsors, John Morris and Catharine Clinger.

Haeffner, Benjamin, about thirty years old, baptized in the presence of the congregation, November 24th. Formerly a Quaker (Queck-
eranus).

Thresy, [Tracy,] Salome, of Frank and Mary Thresy, (date of birth not given), baptized December 4th. Sponsors, John and Martha Mcgay [McGee?].

Grünewald, Mary, of Joseph and Mary Grünewald, born December 4, baptized December 25th. Sponsors, George Kuhn and Mary Kannenn [Cannon?].

McBraid, [McBride?] Sophie, of Andrew and Mary McBraid, born July 27th, baptized December 25th. Sponsors, Henry Kuhn and Mary Seyfferts. [Seybert?].

(Note) N. B. The three following were baptized on the 27th of November.

Victor, Elizabeth, of John and Mary Victor, four years old, baptized November 27th. Sponsors, Patrick McDarmet [McDermott?] and Elizabeth Victor.

Calaghar [Gallagher?] James, of Adam and Mary Calaghar (date of birth not given) baptized November 27th. Sponsors, Charles and Catharine Hasguyt [Hapgood?].

Doff [Duff?] Mary, of Frank and Mary Doff (date of birth not given) baptized, November 27th. Sponsor, McGuy [McHugh?] (The word for sponsors is abbreviated so it is not possible to tell whether it is singular or plural and only one surname without a Christian name of a person is given).

(To be continued)

THE LIFE OF BISHOP CONWELL.

BY MARTIN I. J. GRIFFIN.

CHAPTER XVIII. (*Continued*)

Mgr. Plessis replied in this letter, afterwards translated and published by Bishop Conwell.

QUEBEC, *September 15, 1823.*

My Lord,

I thought of doing myself the honor of writing to you, to congratulate you on the resignation of Mr. Hogan, which I read in a New York paper, when your letter of the 13th came to hand, informing me that the trustees had given him a successor in *the Signor Abbate Inglesi*. A man of this name, a soldier in a regiment of the line, and some time since become a corporal, presented himself to me in 1814, saying that he was born at Rome, that he had been ordained a sub-deacon at Perugia; that, notwithstanding this, he found himself engaged in a regiment or other corps of gentlemen furnished as a gift to Napoleon by the city of Rome; that he had joined the French army; had followed it so far as Moscow; that on his return he had been made prisoner by the Cossacks, and carried to Leipzig, with all the individuals of his corps; that, as a recompense for the services which he rendered the allies in 1813, in the capacity of interpreter of the Italians of the French army who were sent to rebuild Moscow, he was exempted from returning thither himself, and despatched to Lubeck, or to some other place of the Baltic, to be enrolled in a British regiment, (the number of which I have forgotten), with Mr. Muller for its colonel; that this regiment, repassing

by Holland, fell under the command of General Graham, who led it to Berg-op-voorn, where, in an ill-contrived attack, they were all made prisoners, then exchanged, and on their return to England, sent hither. This *Angelo Inglesi*, having no proof of the sub-deaconship which he pretended to have received, I attended but little to him, seeing particularly that he avoided going to confession, though I had invited him to it. Soon after he put himself here, at the head of a theatre; played pantomime; trained actors, and without quitting this profession, became a wine merchant, was married to a Catholic woman by a Presbyterian minister, put her away afterwards, and endeavored to contract another marriage, in which he did not succeed, the Canadian girl whom he courted, having refused to match with him. Finally, he disappeared all of a sudden, without having paid the rent of the house which he occupied. Such is his history. Being at Rome, I directed some one to ascertain at Perugia, if a man of the description had ever been ordained there sub-deacon. I know not whether the commission was well executed. Certain it is that no information on the subject reached me.

It appears certain that a man of the same name has received orders in the diocese of Louisiana, and has acquired there the full confidence of Bishop Dubourg, and has been sent by him to Europe to give an account of the state of his mission, and solicit some aid. Is it the same? Is it another? It is not my business to determine the point. The reliance which I have upon the prudence of our worthy brother of New Orleans, hardly allows me to think that he gave himself up to such an adventurer; that he believed him to be a sub-deacon upon his word; conferred upon him without a dismissory letter superior orders, and made him his confidential functionary to send him charged with an important agency. However this may be, the Trustees of St. Mary's, even should he venture to accept the station of pastor of that congregation, would not long be satisfied with a stranger who could have learn't their language but very imperfectly, to say nothing of the other defects which they will very soon discover in him. It is to be regretted that you could not be in Philadelphia agreeably to

Mr. Harold's wish. I have the honor to subscribe myself
with much respect, My Lord,

Your very humble and obedient servant,

Addressed,

J. O. Bishop of Quebec.

A Monseigneur,

Monsr. l'Evêque de Philadelphie

au Séminaire à Montreal.

PHILADELPHIA, *November 4, 1823.*

I certify that the above is a faithful translation of a letter from the Bishop of Quebec, to the Rt. Rev. Doctor Conwell of Philadelphia, dated Quebec, 15th Sept., 1823, and addressed to Dr. Conwell at the Seminary of Montreal. In testimony whereof I sign My name.

MATTHIAS, J. O. CONWAY,

Public Interpreter.

Within a month Bishop Conwell had returned to Philadelphia, whence he addressed the following letter to Mgr. Plessis.

A PHILADELPHIE, *ce 13e d'octobre 1823.*

Monseigneur,

Votre lettre du 15 septembre nous a servie infiniment, parce que sans cela Monsr. Inglesi ne seroit pas connu, mais aussitôt qu'il étoit regardé comme renégat il a perdu plusieurs amis, de sorte qu'il n'ose guère à présent se mêler de nos affaires.

Monsieur Deabbate consul général du Roi des Sardes qui est de son parti, et qui autrefois l'a conseillé d'entreprendre les fonctions du sacerdoce sans permission et même contre un mandement positif à cet égard, nous menace, à cette heure, à ce que l'on dit, d'un procès qui coutera beaucoup d'avoir chargé cet *Ange* d'aucune action déshonnête, et en demandera les preuves; c'est pourquoi il faut avoir une attestation de son mariage à Québec en 1814 du Registre, s'il y en a, ou autrement un certificat juridique du ministre presbytérien qui assistoit à son mariage, ou des témoins, nonobstant même l'invalidité du contrat, si la loi au Canada le regarde comme

nul ; car, dans ce pays-ci quoiqu'il en soit, la femme pourroit gagner de lui la moitié de ce qu'il possède en donnant des preuves du mariage tel qu'il est, ce qui lui serviroit parce que il est très riche en argent comptant, en vêtements sacerdotaux, en tableaux et en vases sacrés, le fruit apparemment des quêtes qu'il a faites en Europe d'où il vient récemment, en qualité de commissionnaire de Monseigneur du Bourg pour la pauvre église de la Nouvelle-Orléans.

Il est d'importance pour nous de sçavoir si la femme est encore vivante, elle seroit la bienvenue si elle étoit ici aujourd'hui. Il faut aussi une attestation qu'il n'a pas payé le loyer de la maison qu'il occupoit ni ses autres dettes, sous la main des personnes intéressées là dessus, et devant un propre juge ou magistrat . . . qu'il se mit à la tête d'un théâtre, qu'il jouât les pantomimes et qu'il exerçât des acteurs . . . qu'il étoit soldat sous le même nom d'Angelo Inglesi et se professoit sous-diacre.

Monsieur Cannon pourroit bien faire des renseignements à ces occasions là, ou Mr. l'abbé McMahon aura la bonté de rechercher avec lui après la femme et le ministre qui les a marié.

J'accompagnai l'évêque de Boston de chez lui jusqu'à New-York et même dans le vaisseau pour embarquer, avec Monsr. Moranville curé de St. Patrice de Baltimore qui partirent le 1^{er} d'octobre. Mr. Inglesi est à New-York. Un autre jeune prêtre est arrivé d'Irlande à l'aide de Mr. Hogan; il n'a pas encore commencé sa carrière.

La femme accusée de parjure est jugée et condamnée.

La S. Congrégation de la Propaganda a écrite à tous les Evêques des Etats-Unis et les prie de faire des contributions pour faire batir une cathédrale à Philadelphie et pour acheter de terre pour un cimetière, afin que l'église soit libre.

J'envoie par la poste le dernier pamphlet ou brochure à l'occasion de l'Eglise.

J'ai l'honneur d'être votre très humble serv. et fidèle ami

✠ HENRY évêque de Philadelphie.

A MGR. PLESSIS,

Evêque de Québec, à Québec, Canada.

Translation.

PHILADELPHIA, *October 15, 1823.*

My Lord :

Your letter of September 15, has helped us a great deal, for without it Mr. Inglesi would not be known. As soon as he was looked on as a renegade (or apostate) he lost several friends, so that now he dares to meddle very little with our affairs.

Mr. Deabbate, consul general of the King of Sardinia, who is of his party and who previously had advised him to undertake the duties of the priesthood without permission, and even against a positive order to that effect, now threatens us, as popular rumor has it, with a lawsuit which will cost much for having charged that *Angel* with a dishonest action, and will require the proofs ; for this reason, it is necessary to have a certificate of his marriage at Quebec from the Register of 1814, if there is one there, or otherwise a legal certificate (affidavit) of the Presbyterian minister who officiated at his marriage, or of the witnesses, notwithstanding the invalidity of the contract itself, if the Canadian law regards it as null, because whatever it may be in this country the wife could get from him the half of his possessions by giving the proofs of his marriage, such as it was, which would be of use to him, because he is very rich in ready money in priestly vestments, in pictures and in sacred vessels—the apparent result of his begging in Europe, whence he lately came, as commissioner for Mgr. Du Bourg, in aid of the Church at New Orleans.

It is important for us to know if the wife is still living. She would be most welcome were she here to-day. We need also an affidavit from the interested parties, sworn to before a proper judge or magistrate that he paid neither the rent of the house he occupied nor his other debts . . . that he became Manager of a theatre, that he acted pantomimes and that he taught the actors . . . that he was a soldier under that same name Angelo Inglesi and claimed to be a subdeacon.

Mr. Cannon could very easily give the information concerning these, or will Rev. Mr. McMahon have the kindness,

to look with him for the woman and the minister who married them.

I accompanied the Bishop of Boston from his home as far as New York, and even into the ship in which he was to sail with Mr. Moranville, Pastor of St. Patrick's, Baltimore, who left the 1st of October. Mr. Inglesi is in New York, Another young priest has arrived from Ireland to assist Mr. Hogan; he has not yet begun his ministry.

The woman charged with perjury was tried and found guilty. The Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda has written to all the Bishops of the United States, praying them to contribute to the building of a Cathedral in Philadelphia, and to buy the ground for a cemetery, in order that the Church may be free. I send by mail the last pamphlet or brochure concerning the Church.

I have the honor to be your most humble servant and
faithful friend

HENRY CONWELL,

Bishop of Philadelphia.

TO MGR. PLESSIS

Bishop of Quebec,
Quebec, Canada.

The Bishop speaks of Inglesi's success in collecting in Europe for Bishop Du Bourg, of New Orleans. The following account of this matter printed in the National Gazette of this time gives details.

(From the Reformer, Vol. III, Phila. 1822, p. 191).

The Piedmontese Gazette of the 26th of February under date of Fenoe, says, that the Abbé Inglesi sent by Mr. Du Bourg, Bishop of Louisiana, to solicit from the friends of humanity and religion assistance for that interesting mission, has obtained by subscription the following sums: From the Pope, 20,400 francs; the Emperor Francis, 20,000; the Emperor Alexander, 20,000; the Grand Duke of Tuscany, 11,474; the Sovereign of Lucca, 10,200; Cardinal Gonsalvi, 471; different ministers, 21,804; Cash, 46,224; making in the whole

amount 150,573 francs. A part of this sum has been already sent to America. The Abbé is still at Turin, where his pious cares will be crowned with fresh success.

After collecting these sums his character was discovered. Archbishop Marechal wrote to Father Harold on October 15th, saying :

Yes, it is a notorious fact, that cardinal Consalvi, secretary of state, has expelled L'Abbé Inglesi from the territory of the pontifical government. This fact has been repeatedly related to me by cardinals, prelates, and a number of clergymen and laymen of the first distinction in Rome ; and I can assure you, that it is as public in that great city, as the excommunication of Mr. Hogan may be in Philadelphia.

It is, likewise, a certain fact, that the ambassadors of the sovereigns from whose liberality Mr. Inglesi had obtained at Leyback considerable contributions for the missions in this country, have written to their respective courts, as soon as they were informed of the true character and morals of that famous abbé. The duke de Blacas, particularly, acted with such promptitude, that the King of France was the first person in his empire who was informed of the scandals which determined cardinal Consalvi to pass the sentence of expulsion abovementioned.

The above letter is taken from the Postscript to Rev. Mr. Harold's address to the Roman Catholics of Philadelphia, p. 26.

Finally, a letter arrived from Bishop Du Bourg disposing of what remnants of priestly reputation still clung to this unfortunate man.

NEW ORLEANS, *20th October, 1823.*

An Italian clergyman ordained by me and then sent by me to Europe on an errand which supposed a degree of confidence, to which he unfortunately did not prove himself entitled, lately arrived in Philadelphia, and as he knows he would not be well

received in this, his adopted diocese, he may probably apply to your Reverence for admission into yours. I would be sorry to take down the character of a priest, but duty compels me to invite you to be on your guard. I have strong reasons for believing him to be unworthy of any trust, yet I would not wish you to make any other use of my name than by requesting him as a preliminary to any faculty in your diocese to exhibit to you fresh testimonials and dimissorials from me, which he certainly will never apply for. Be pleased to keep this entirely to yourself. If you think it necessary to communicate it to your Vicar General, enjoin on him the same discretion. I fear he would give some great scandal. His name is A. Inglesi, once alas, very dear to me for his apparent virtues. Never did a man practise upon a Bishop so subtle and so sacrilegious an imposition. May the all-merciful God forgive me his ordination, which I will always regard as a strain upon my episcopacy.

I have the honor to be with respectful and brotherly attachment, Rt. Rev. Sir,

Your most humble servant,

L. WM. BP. OF NEW ORLEANS.

Father Harold had this letter printed in the Democratic Press of Nov. 22nd, 1823, in reply to the pamphlet of R. W. Meade, noted below.

There is much more evidence available as to the character and past of the Rev. Mr. Inglesi, but quite enough has been presented to show that he was a consummate rogue. But as he had deceived Bishop Du Bourg and several prelates in Europe, the Trustees can hardly be charged with knowing his character when they chose him for their pastor. They seem to have had an intuitive faculty for finding such men, and a peculiar attraction for them. It may go some way towards explaining much in connection with the Hoganite schism, and other similar affairs that the United States was overrun with men of that stamp, who had left their own

country for the country's good, and came hither in the hopes of finding a Bishop who in the great need of laborers would receive them without close scrutiny into their records, or of being taken up by some malcontent congregation and aiding them in their squabbles for the sake of a salary. But having adopted him, the Trustees defended him even after his true character was made public. In an Appendix to the pamphlet, "An Address of the Lay Trustees of St. Mary's Church to their Fellow Citizens", they complain that Father Harold had "had the imprudence to circulate a report that Rev. Mr. Inglesi had been banished from Rome and was under interdict from that court. To which they replied as follows:

The Trustees, aware that the adoption of such a course was only one of the many base measures heretofore resorted to, in order to keep up, and foment the divisions among the uneducated part of the congregation, conceive themselves bound to expose this irregular, indelicate, and even dishonorable proceeding on the part of Mr. Harold; the sole object they have in view, is to unmask *the real author* of all the divisions and disturbances in the Church, and they will seize every proper opportunity of so doing, until he be removed from among us, or placed in that situation that he can no longer do harm by his misrepresentations.

In furtherance of this object, they now present the correspondence which had taken place on the subject of the Rev. Mr. Inglesi; and they would further add, in addition to the very respectable testimony of Mr. Deabbate, Consul General of Sardinia, in this city, of the virtuous character and high respectability of Mr. Inglesi, that the Trustees have in their possession public documents which prove that Mr. Inglesi went to Rome on an honorable mission from Bishop Dubourg, of Louisiana; that he was received, and treated with the greatest respect, by the Sovereign Pontiff, the cardinals, and foreign ambassadors in that city; that, after finishing his

mission in the most flattering manner to himself, he visited, and was received, and admitted to the royal presence of the sovereigns of Russia, Austria, France, Holland, Naples, Tuscany, Lucca, Parma and Placentia, and by the king and queen of Piedmont.

The Trustees have several printed journals, of France, Rome, Florence, and other cities of Europe, which speak in the very highest terms of the talents and virtues of Mr. Inglesi, *all which are subsequent to his departure from Rome*—they state the importance of his mission, and the happy success he had met with. In fine, they most completely falsify the base attempt made by the Rev. W. Harold to injure his character, since it is fully established by printed documents, that Mr. Inglesi left Rome with the most flattering encomiums, and subsequently visited and resided at almost all the courts of Europe; was presented to the sovereigns of each, and was by them not only well received, but treated with unusual respect and attention, and aided in the object of his mission.

Here follows a number of letters intended to bolster up the Trustees' case and Inglesi's character. Meade writes to Deabbate, Consul General of the King of Sardinia, stating that Harold had said that "Mr. Inglesi is actually under an interdiction from the court of Rome, and that it was on that account that he had refused to permit him to officiate at St. Mary's." He asks the Consul to testify as to Inglesi's personal character and standing as a priest. Deabbate replied "by transmitting to you copies of three letters which have passed on the subject." He had written asking Inglesi's own account of the matter, Inglesi wrote to Harold a sermon on charity, and stated that he had written to Rome on the subject of his standing there. Harold wrote to Deabbate, to correct the report of his statements regarding Inglesi. This letter will perhaps show the value of the Hoganite contentions on the subject, and their insufficiency even if admitted to rehabilitate Inglesi's character.

The Vicar General Mr. Harold to the Consul General of His Sardinian Majesty.

PHILADELPHIA, *September 11, 1823.*

Sir,

I have this day received a letter from the reverend Mr. Inglesi, enclosing a copy of a note purporting to have been addressed to him by you, and dated on the 5th of this month.

In this note you state some particulars respecting my interview with you, on which I find it necessary to recur to your better recollection ; for I am persuaded that you are incapable of misstating any thing wilfully.

I did not tell you that Mr. Inglesi had been suspended at Rome. My expressions were, that I had it from good authority, that he had been ordered out of that city by the Cardinal Secretary of State. I mentioned to you the person from whom I had received that information.

I did not say that the Cardinal Secretary had communicated this event, or the motives of it, to certain courts in Europe. My statement was, that the ministers of those courts, resident at Rome, had made such communications.

You only do me justice, when you acknowledge in your note, that I requested you to inform Mr. Inglesi of all that I had told you ; and I rely on your candor so confidently as to expect you will enable me to set Mr. Inglesi right, on the particulars mentioned above.

I cannot close this without saying a word as to my motives for waiting on you on the occasion in question. I had heard of your having introduced Mr. Inglesi to your acquaintance, and that you had even favored the proposed measure of his officiating at St. Mary's, under the appointment of the gentlemen acting as trustees of that church. It was therefore necessary that I should apprise you of whatever I had heard of Mr. Inglesi's character ; and the expediency of doing so was the more strongly impressed on my mind before I had conversed five minutes with you, as you distinctly acknowledged to me that you had advised Mr. Inglesi to officiate at St. Mary's without the leave of the ordinary, and to trust to the Court of Rome for a sanction of that proceeding.

But Inglesi, whether because he did not wish to come into conflict with episcopal authority, or whether he feared that his past would not stand the scrutiny that such a contest would surely provoke in Philadelphia, had withdrawn, and so disappears from the scene.

The Trustees had used him to vindicate, as they thought, their own desire for peace and to show the inplacable hostility of the Bishop and his clergy.

The Trustees of St. Mary's Church, in thus laying the foregoing correspondence before the public, are influenced alone by a sense of the imperious duty they owe to their fellow-citizens, and to their Roman Catholic brethren throughout the United States. The accompanying letters exhibit a further and more convincing proof of the impracticability of restoring harmony to the congregation of St. Mary's Church, so long as the Rev. William V. Harold, persisting in his unclerical and unchristianlike conduct, is willing to sacrifice every honorable feeling to personal and interested views.

JOHN LEAMY,

JOHN ASHLEY,

RICHARD W. MEADE,

EDWARD BARRY,

JOHN T. SULLIVAN,

BERNARD GALLAGHER,

ANTHONY GROVES,

ARCHIBALD RANDALL.

So they let Inglesi go and reinstated Hogan.

Meanwhile the war of printers' ink had been waged with unrelenting fury. Small shot in the form of newspaper "advertisements" and broadsides in pretentious pamphlets flew back and forth without rest or considerable interval. Many of these have been referred to or quoted at length in this chapter. In them the summer attempt of Meade was related in full, and the Inglesi incident exposed on both sides. Some other volleys remain to be mentioned. On August 19th Hogan wrote a letter which the Democratic *Press* refused to publish, saying that his letter was a libel on the Religion and country of

a majority of his hearers. "Wo to the man, whatever garb he may assume, or in whatever guise he may appear, who would set that religion afloat in a sea of blood, and convert that country into a dwelling place for slaves, knaves and assassins."

But the American *Sentinel* accepted and printed the letter, which was answered of the 26th in a three-column article signed, "An Irishman." The writer denounced Hogan for declaring that Ireland was a nation of "furies and bloodsuckers," and defended Harold from "the violent and vile aspersions which Hogan vomited forth in his tirade." Hogan was apparently nearing the end of his influence and was making frantic efforts to retain it.

In October, Mr. Harold published a pamphlet under the title: "An Address to the Roman Catholics of Philadelphia," containing 56 pages taken up principally with citations and explanations of Canon Law. He referred to the "accession of numbers if not of strength" which the schism had received in Inglesi and Deabbate, and discussed the proceedings of the Trustees with Ricco, Miers and Inglesi.

Promptly, on Oct. 22nd, Meade took up the cause of the schismatics, and issued "An Address to the Roman Catholics of Philadelphia, in Reply to Mr. Harold's Address."

Concerning Harold, he wrote :

He ten years since created the first dissension that ever afflicted St. Mary's Congregation; he was then as violent against the worthy Bishop of this diocess, as he is now insolent in supporting the present poor unfortunate incumbent (p. 19).

Of Ricco,

Henry Toland, John Leamy, L. Clapier, Juan Man. Cardeza, Jno. Vaughan, Js. Gardette certify that Jno. Ricco came

to Philadelphia, 1816. In November 1817 he went to Alabama to land granted by the U. S. to French emigrants. Was there until 1821. He came to Philadelphia and sailed in the brig *Rose*, Capt. Tubbs for Gibraltar, on May 4th 1821. Arrived in Madrid, was restored and made Vicar General of the Armies of Spain and Archbishop of Valencia, Vicar General, Governor of the Archbishoprick, Deputy to Cortes from Monovar, in Valencia (p. 22).

Of Miers,

Rev. Dr. Servandus Mier who was in the U. S. in 1821 and 1822 was a native of Mexico, a clergyman of great respectability, persecuted by Spanish government for his defense of the liberties of Mexico. In 1823 Deputy of Cortes in Mexico. So Jose A. Torrera, Charge d'affairs from Mexico certified on Oct. 13th 1823.

In the latter part of October, Bishop Conwell went on a visitation of the diocese. We find that he was in Lancaster on the 26th, where there is a record of a marriage performed by him. How much further he got is not known, but the journey seems to have provoked this comment from Father Gallitzin, writing to Archbishop Marechal, Oct. 28th 1823:

No Bishop had ever penetrated to the distant missions of Western Pennsylvania. Abp. Carroll was on his way in 1802, but frightened by the horrible description they gave him at Chambersburg of the mountains, roads etc., he retraced his steps. Bishop Egan penetrated as far as Pittsburg, and the neighboring congregation, but no further. Bishop Conwell has not done as much. (*Souvenir of Loretto*, p. 48.)

(To be continued)

RECEPTION TO MONSIGNOR BONZANO BY THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The new year was most auspiciously inaugurated by the American Catholic Historical Society on the evening of Monday, January the third, when at the home of the Society a reception was tendered to his Excellency, Monsignor Bonzano, titular Archbishop of Militene, and Apostolic Delegate to the United States. The reception took place in the lecture room of the old mansion, the guest of honor, surrounded by the members of the receiving committee, standing on a dais at the north end of the room. A background of palms had been arranged behind the chairs of the dignitaries, the coat-of-arms of the Delegate being suspended over his Excellency's chair, while the floral decorations were appropriately of white and yellow blooms. The Bishops and Monsignors added a brilliant touch to the color scheme, attired as they were in the formal ecclesiastical dress, known as the "abito piano," black cassocks with red trimming, violet sashes, and violet ferrajuolas.

Receiving with Monsignor Bonzano were Bishop McCort, the Auxiliary Bishop of Philadelphia, and Bishop Ortynsky, of the Greek Ruthenian Church. The guests were presented to his Excellency by Rev. William J. Lallou, the president of the Society. Standing in the receiving line were: Monsignori Drumgoole, Fisher, Coghlan, Sinnott and Crane, Monsignor Jazbek, the Syro-Maronite Chor-Bishop, Mr. James M. Willcox, Dr. Lawrence F. Flick, Sir James Ryan, K.C.S.G., Mr. Her-

man Vetterlein, Mr. M. F. Hanson, Mr. Ignatius J. Dohan, Mr. Edward J. Galbally, Dr. Austin O'Malley, Mr. William V. McGrath, Jr., Mr. Peter F. Kernan, and Mr. John J. Ferreck.

For nearly two hours, from eight until ten o'clock, the guests, many of them prominent priests and distinguished laymen, Catholic and non-Catholic, passed in procession and were greeted by his Excellency, who charmed all by his engaging manner. Many of the visitors profited by the occasion to view the interesting possessions of the library and museum of the Society, distributed through the various rooms of the building.

The Delegate expressed himself as delighted with the reception and much honored by it. At the meeting of the Board of Managers held fifteen days after this affair, following the precedent of the Society's action towards former Apostolic Delegates to whom it had given receptions, the name of Monsignor Bonzano was added to the list of honorary members of the Society.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE FRENCH IN THE HEART OF AMERICA. By John Finley, Commissioner of Education and President of the University of the State of New York. New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. 1915.

The work before us is an exposition of the debt of the United States to France, which gave to this country the Mississippi Valley, first by discovery and exploration, and then by deed in the Louisiana Purchase. For France, the author points out, thus gave to America a territory the possession of which enabled our country to become a world power. We read the history of the French pioneers, the grey friars and the black gowns, who opened the way from the Labrador gate of the Saint Lawrence to the Great Lakes, from the Great Lakes to the Mississippi, and from the Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico. In turn there pass before us pictures, vivid as in a photo-film, of Jacques Cartier, Samuel Champlain and Jean Nicolet, then of the heroic explorers and holy missionaries, Br  b  uf, Garnier, Jogues and Lalement, next Joliet and P  re Marquette, St. Luson and Allouez, and finally Robert Ren   Cavelier, Sieur de la Salle, who completed the journey which his predecessors had accomplished in ever-increasing part, from the salt waters of the North Atlantic to the warm salt waters of the Gulf of Mexico by the inland route. The history of the journey from Cape Breton to the Delta of the Mississippi is the story of a century and a half, for so long did it take to open the way.

After the period of exploration, the story is continued less in detail : the bursting of the Mississippi Bubble and the consequent failure to colonize the great valley ; the defeat of the French at Quebec, marking the passing of New France into the hands of the English, to be held by them for but a short time before it reverted to its original owners, and finally the sale of the territory to the United States by the far-seeing Napoleon at a bargain price, for its equivalent in value was

esteemed the small island of Guadaloupe. Then came the War of 1812 to confirm to the United States the fruits of the Louisiana Purchase.

The story now becomes graphic again as we read of the "peopling of the wilderness," the anabasis of America, when the footprints of the buffalo became the paths of the *coureurs de bois* and the steel rails succeeded to the trails of these heroic pioneers. The development of the resources of the great valley forms matter for several telling chapters, tracing the rise of Western cities from old French forts and French portage paths.

"France evoked from the unknown the valley that may in more than one sense be called the heart of America. Her *coureurs de bois* opened its path made by the buffalo and the red men to the shod feet of Europe. Her explorers planted the water-shed with slender, silent portage traces that have been multiplied into thousands of noisy streets, and tied indissolubly the lakes of the north to the rivers of the south from which they were long ago severed by nature. Her one white sail above Niagara marked the way of a mighty commerce. Her soldier sowed the molten seeds of tumultuous cities on the sites of their forts, and her priests and friars consecrated with their faith and prayers forest trail, portage path, ship's sail, and leaden plate."

The work evidently lays no claim to being a critical history, but it can be recommended as an interesting story, romantic as a novel, told in excellent English, in a style marked by striking use of metaphor. The writer displays a certain *naïveté* in mingling his personal experiences with the history which he is relating with the effect of making the personal equation unduly, though no doubt ingenuously, large. Besides writing the history of the Mississippi Valley, the author presents in very readable form an idea of the present-day resources of America. A map of the country treated in the text would have contributed to a readier understanding of the story. A good index makes the book serviceable as a work of reference.

W. J. L.

THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW. For the Study of the Church History of the United States. Board of Editors: Right Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D.D.; Rev. Patrick J. Healy, D.D.; Rev. William Turner, D.D.; Rev. Paschal Robinson, O.F.M., D.D.; Rev. Nicholas A. Weber, S.M., D.D.; Rev. Peter Guilday, Ph.D. Volume I comprises numbers from April 1915 to January 1916. Published quarterly by the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

If the RECORDS has been somewhat tardy in saying a word of welcome to the *Catholic Historical Review*, the reason is not to be sought in any lack of interest in the newcomer into the field of historical research and publicity. The work that remains to be done in this department of Catholic study and letters is greater far than the workers in sight can cope with, and will well repay all the effort put into it. This of itself should bespeak the interest of all in the new quarterly, and the fact that it is under the sponsorship of the Catholic University gives the enterprise still further claim to attention and good-will. For it is gratifying to note the gradual and natural processes by which the University at Washington is equipping itself to take the place it was wisely designed to occupy as the centre and mainspring of the Catholic life and thought of the Union. Its activities and academic prestige go on increasing, and the founding of the *Catholic Historical Review* is fresh evidence of the rôle the great intellectual centre at the capital of the nation is about to play in American Catholic movements.

Taking the four numbers of the quarterly so far issued, the interest of the review is shared between the strictly academic and the cultural, between the student of history and the general reader. This dual appeal is seen in the choice of the subjects treated, covering not only various phases of the career of the Church in the New World, but also taking in a wide range of dates. Thus in the first number one finds, besides the Foreword by Cardinal Gibbons and the Introductory by Bishop Shahan, articles on the Flemish Franciscan Missionaries in North America (1674—1738), the Rev. John C. Fen-

wick, O. P. (1759—1815), the First Ecclesiastical Synod of California (1852), and Columbus and the Santa Hermandad in 1492. In addition to these topics of general interest, there are in the same number departments addressed to the more technical reader of history, viz. first, the Miscellany, which gives the Annals of the Leopoldine Association and Catholic Archives; secondly, the section of Documents; next, the reviews of books, followed by Notes and Bibliography. These special departments have their place also in the succeeding issues, which have among their leading articles very readable and carefully prepared papers on the late Bishop of Covington, the Church in Cuba, A Forgotten American Hymnodist, Pioneer Efforts in Catholic Journalism in the United States, Early Conversions to the Church in America (1521—1830), the Rise of the National Catholic Churches in the United States. The writers are drawn from all parts of the United States and are recognized authorities on the subjects they treat.

From the foregoing summary of the contents of the first volume of the *Catholic Historical Review*, it will be seen how well it recommends itself to all the members of the American Catholic Historical Society, for it appeals directly both to those who follow their history to its sources so as to trace the causes and the effects of the different movements and events, as well as to those who read the story of the Church in America more for their own edification and entertainment and information. Both of these groups the new historical quarterly takes within its circle; and it is very much to be wished that its subscribers will be amply large enough not only to encourage the very able corps of editors and contributors by their interest, but also to sustain the undertaking by their support. No one will gainsay the fact that it is the very plain duty of our generation to make a serious effort to keep from perishing the records of our forbears in the faith, who wrought so well for America; and it should be a pleasant duty withal.



Phone, Walnut 6565

PRIMO DYE WORKS

Dry Cleaners and Dyers

15th and Walnut, Flanders Bldg.
510-12-14 South Thirteenth Street

Bell Phone, Spruce 4559

Walter E. Lanagan

**Storage Batteries for Automobiles
Motor Boats**

and all other purposes

Charging and Repairing

"Do it Electrically"

123 N. 15th St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Owen Letter's Sons

Best Coal

Main Yard:

Trenton Ave. and Westmoreland

Philadelphia

Rheu-ma-tis-go

Combers' Celebrated Rheumatic Remedy

Thirty-five Cents

Made only by

Comber and Comber

Pharmacists

*24th and Lombard Streets
Philadelphia*

Bell Phone, Dick 824

Robert Kane Estate

**LEHIGH AND
SCHUYLKILL**

COAL

*1923-31 Washington Avenue
Philadelphia*

Bell Phone, Locust 383

Prompt Attention to Hurry Work

F. T. BROWN

Brazing and Welding Co.

Automobile and Aluminum Work a Specialty

"Always on the Job"

225 South 24th St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Both Phones

YOU'LL NEED ME

Lawrence Farrell

Real Estate Agent

Notary Public

710 South Twentieth St.

Philadelphia

Office Phones: { Bell, Poplar 1822.
Keystone, Park 4303 D.

A. MACBRIDE H. WILSON J. MACBRIDE

A. MACBRIDE & CO.

Heating, Roofing, Plumbing, Brickwork

Office, 1341 W. Girard Ave.

Shop, 630 W. Thompson St.

Keystone Phone: Park 4939 A

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

95

RECORDS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOL. XXVII

JUNE, 1916

No. 2

FATHER PETER DE SMET—MIGHTY SOWER¹ 1801-1873

BY THE REV. JOSEPH M. CORRIGAN, D. D.

“Now the seed is the Word of God.” Who would sow this wondrous seed must possess it in abundance. He must sow it lavishly. He may not spare it even on stony ground, nor stint it in soil that has no depth. He must be prepared to have some fall by the wayside and be trodden down. He must sow even where thorns threaten and where moisture will fail. It is not his to judge which shall prove to be the good ground of a true and perfect heart. Therefore generously, in much patience and sacrifice, must he do his service for the Lord of the Harvest. From time to time God raises up men who become mighty in the exacting but privileged and sacred task of sowing in the hearts of new

¹ *The Life of Father De Smet, S.J. (1801-1873)*. By E. Laveille, S.J. Authorized translation by Marion Lindsay. Introduction by Charles Coppens, S.J. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1915. Pp. xxii-400.

peoples, as in fallow fields, the seed of His Divine Word. Such a sower, mighty, and patient, and mortified, was Father Peter De Smet, of the Society of Jesus, the apostle of the Rocky Mountains. His life-story told by Father Laveille of the same Society, and now done by Marian Lindsay into most readable English, all free from the hackneyed phrasing so dear to most biographers, proves Father De Smet to have had these difficult qualities essential to his apostolic mission; he possessed the Word of God abundantly, he sowed it lavishly and he did his work in heroic patience and sacrifice.

The seed of the Word of God which Father De Smet was to sow had been garnered in his own heart. It had in turn been planted there by the careful instruction of Catholic parents and nurtured in the sunshine of Catholic practice in the holy atmosphere of a truly Catholic home. Joost De Smet, his father, and Marie Jeanne Buydens, his mother (his father's second wife), gave vigilant care to the childhood of their many little ones; and Peter, who was born a twin on January 30th, 1801, grew to manhood in surroundings replete with lessons of piety. His boyhood, spent in his native town Termonde, on the river Schelde, in Belgium, gave ample promise of the disposition that so ably fitted him in after years for his difficult tasks as pioneer and missionary. He had a strong and vigorous constitution; he was hardy, indifferent to danger and at the same time affectionate, gentle and generous. These are wonderful qualities; and their combination is so much more wonderful that we might be inclined to accept the author's statement of their happy union in the character of Father De Smet, as an author's legitimate hyperbole; but as one reads the almost unvarnished tale from his own lips and letters, it is gradually borne in on the reader that this man was indeed an apostle ably and especially fitted for his high mission.

The early education of Father De Smet seems to have suffered from too frequent changes from one school to another, due in large part to that very tendency to a roving disposition so well attested by the later events of his life. But at the age of twenty years, in his second year at Mechlin, he encountered in Father Nerinckx, a missionary from Kentucky, the influence which was to decide his career. Father Charles Nerinckx, himself a man of such zeal as to be fit inspiration for a future apostle, had returned to Belgium in 1817 to raise funds and to procure active assistance for the American missions. He made a second visit to his native land in 1821 for the same purpose. He asked for volunteers so badly needed by the Jesuit missions in the United States. From among the applicants Father Nerinckx, after a thorough examination, selected nine to return with him to America. From the preparatory seminary at Mechlin only two were chosen and one of these was Peter De Smet.

At this early stage of his career we are met by the extraordinary fact that he decided to leave Belgium without saying good-bye to his family. The young men of the party felt that rather than jeopardize a well-defined vocation they should limit their leave-taking to farewell letters written before sailing. To the end of his days Peter De Smet had a poignant realization, as well he might, of the great sacrifice thus imposed upon his parents. We are told that the memory of his departure remained always like an open wound.

They sailed July 24th, 1821. It is a typical incident that when his friend, Monseigneur De Ram, asked young De Smet to give him some token of remembrance, Peter, taking from his pocket a penny, bent it in two with his teeth, and gave it to his friend. Forty-two days out, the American brig called the "Columbia" entered the Delaware River and went to her moorings at Philadelphia. From Philadel-

phia the missionaries went to Baltimore and thence to Georgetown where they presented themselves to Father Kohlmann, the Superior of the Jesuits in the United States. He shortly afterwards sent them to Whitemarsh to enter upon their novitiate. Not two years had elapsed at Whitemarsh when an unforeseen circumstance brought Peter De Smet in touch with the field of his future apostolate. The Maryland province, beset with difficulties, became too poor to support the twenty young novices, when Bishop Dubourg, of New Orleans, made a seemingly providential offer to the Jesuits to found a mission for the Indian tribes in Missouri. Peter De Smet found his fondest dream realized when he was accepted for this most difficult mission. Bishop Dubourg asked the newly-appointed Superior, Father Van Quickenborne, how he would accomplish the journey, as, much to the Bishop's regret, he was not in a position to furnish funds for that purpose. "Don't worry; we will go on foot and beg our food;" was the cheerful reply. "All my little band are of one mind as to this."

At Baltimore, Father Van Quickenborne hired two wagons, each drawn by six horses, to transport the baggage to Wheeling on the Ohio River. They started off with that simple and inadequate equipment to open a mission to savages fifteen hundred miles distant; and the eye of Faith can now discern the wonderful fact so hidden from those young hearts in those days, that already the seed was falling and its first fruits would be a new Province of the Society of Jesus in the centre of the United States; and that the hundredfold harvest would be missions from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes and westward to the shores of the Pacific. The pleasant reading made by the story of their journey by land and water until their arrival at St. Louis is apt to make one forget that the romance and adventure are but the cloak that mantles hardship, poverty

and self-denial. They were welcomed at St. Louis, then a town of about five thousand people; but impatient to reach his post, Father Van Quickenborne mounted a horse and set out for the village of Florissant, about one and a half miles from which, upon an eminence commanding a fine view of the country, was the house to be used by the Jesuit Mission. Three days later his young traveling companions joined him there. The missionaries proceeded at once to make themselves at home. The dark and stuffy attic became the dormitory of the novices and its floor, softened by a Buffalo robe or a bundle of straw, served as their bed. The ground floor was divided by a curtain which separated the Chapel from the bedroom occupied by the Superior and his assistant. One of the two outhouses which in a former day had served successively as a chicken-house and then a pig pen, was transformed into a study for the novices and also a community refectory. The other outhouses were used as a shelter for plows and farm implements and one served as a kitchen.

The Ladies of the Sacred Heart had been established some three years before in Florissant. Madam Duchesne, a woman renowned for her virtues, was the Superior at the time and began at once, though in great poverty, the gracious story of assistance that was to continue, in material things, when possible, but always in supernatural ways of prayer and hopeful sympathy, through the long years of Father De Smet's heroic work. The hardships and engrossing labors of the early months at Florissant were not permitted to interfere with the routine and regular spiritual exercises of the novitiate. On October 10th, 1823, when two years had now passed since our young men entered the novitiate at Whitemarsh, the six Florissant novices made their first vows; and two days later entered upon the studies that were to prepare them for the priesthood. The years of the philosophy and theology courses

were years likewise of spiritual preparation, and on September 23rd, 1827, in the parish church at Florissant Bishop Rosati conferred Holy Orders upon young De Smet and three companions; the following day, the feast of Our Lady of Mercy, Father De Smet celebrated his first Mass. Despite the fact that the mission was in dire need of priests, Father Van Quickenborne would not curtail the course described by St. Ignatius, by omitting the "third year", and he even took upon himself the duties of instructor. The exercises of the "third year" were concluded July 31st, 1828.

The time of probation and preparation for an apostolate such as was to be Father De Smet's would seem to have been long enough and arduous enough. Years, however, were to elapse before his first step in his lifework might be taken. The City of St. Louis, equaled by few in its commercial and agricultural advantages, was growing apace and already making good its claim to the beautiful title of the "Queen of the West." The main object of the Jesuits in coming to Missouri had been the evangelization of the Indians; but a ministry to the whites seemed to offer at that time an opportunity for more abundant and lasting good. St. Louis College was opened November 2, 1829, with forty pupils, and the enrollment grew constantly. In 1830, Father De Smet became procurator, prefect of studies, and professor of English. As procurator, Father De Smet bore the brunt of the limitations and embarrassments of poverty. Money became an absolute necessity. Additional missionaries were also needed and Father De Smet, whose health was failing, was ordered to return to his native land and make an appeal to the generous Belgians. His journey was very successful, and though his impaired health was not yet reestablished, he started to return to America with five young men as aspirants for missionary labor and with eight thousand dollars in money. These were fair results

for his ten months of labor in Belgium. His health, however, grew rapidly worse on shipboard and he was put ashore at Deal in England. The other missionaries continued their voyage.

After some time he returned to Belgium and passing through a period of utter discouragement sought and obtained in 1835 permission to sever his connection with the Society of Jesus. Some time after, still groping for his true work, he was given faculties for preaching and hearing confessions by the Bishop of Ghent. Various activities, all indeed unfitted to his character and talents, occupied him for some time. Meantime the Indian missions were a perennial theme in the mind of Father De Smet. He knew that the missionaries longed for his return and he felt that he must go back to them. He finally decided it was his duty to return to Missouri, and beg to be readmitted to the Society of Jesus and to take up once more his chosen labors. He left Termonde finally in September, 1837, and with four missionaries arrived in Paris to embark from Havre. Again he suffered a relapse which for eight days kept him in a very precarious condition. On the eve of his companions' departure for Havre he was desperately ill. Two physicians of note declared that if he sailed he would not live three days. The day of departure arrived and Father De Smet accompanied the others to the boat, said good-bye, and returned to the city. The ship left the harbor and was already at sea when those aboard saw a little skiff making for the ship. In it was Father De Smet going to join his companions.

In many ways Father De Smet found a new Missouri. Giant strides had been made in material progress; and in spiritual things the progress was also very gratifying. Already the Indian work had been begun by Father Van Quickenborne. After many conversions among the Osages and the Iowas, Father Van Quickenborne had gone to the

Kickapoos in 1836, but his strength was broken and worn out by giant labors. He died, aged only fifty, in August, 1837. The young religious trained under him hastened to claim their heritage and take up his work. Father De Smet was to pass his noviceship in Indian work with the Potawattomi. He left St. Louis May 10th, 1838, Father Verreyet and Brother Mazelli joining him at Leavenworth. In going up the Missouri he greatly admired the vast river dotted with many islands, but the scenic beauty did not lessen the many dangers with which the journey was fraught. Crowds of Indians came to the landing to greet the missionaries and wherever the boat stopped for fuel the priests went ashore to visit the different villages. Everywhere they were most cordially received. The visit to the Otoes enabled Father De Smet to initiate himself in the ways of the savage. The following lines give us an idea of his impressions :

The village is composed of several large mud huts, each containing about ten families, and several buffalo-hide tents reeking with vermin. The women slave for the men, and appear most miserable. Some are blind, others have only one eye, and all appear extremely dirty. Their dress consists of a skirt of deer-skin to the knee, with tunic, garters and shoes of the same hide. The whole costume is greasy and black, as though they had wiped their hands on it for a century. Both men and women wore bracelets of polished metal, and five or six strings of chona or glass beads around the neck.

I was ushered into the large hut of the chief or king. The queen placed a cushion of deer-skin, shiny with grease, upon a still greasier cane mat, and made me signs to be seated. She then presented me with a roughly-cut wooden plate, which I think had not seen water since it was made, and served me on it a dish of disgusting appearance, cooked by herself. Opposite me a dozen wolf-dogs, seated on their haunches, eyed my plate. They seemed to envy me my happiness, and showed

willingness to aid me in disposing of the food. I was hungry, I admit; but my stomach revolted at the sight of that mysterious stew. I said to myself: "No airs now, you are not in Belgium; begin your apprenticeship. When in Rome do as the Romans do." I took a spoonful of the mess and found it delicious. It was a fricassee of buffalo tongue, mixed with bear's grease and the flour of wild sweet potatoes. I evinced my appreciation of the princess's hospitality by rubbing my stomach as a sign of satisfaction, and returned the plate to her much cleaner than when she gave it.

Idleness and drunkenness were the chief evils the missionaries had to combat. They had first to master a difficult language and undertake the humanly impossible task of making over the very nature of these poor human beings, of domesticating men accustomed to a wandering life. These preliminaries accomplished, they must turn themselves to abolishing polygamy and rampant superstition. Yet success did not tarry. Before the close of 1838 Father De Smet was able to write:

A great number of Indians have asked to be instructed. We have opened a school, but for the want of a large hut we can only receive thirty children. Twice a day instructions are given to those preparing for baptism. We have administered the Sacrament to one hundred and eighteen Indians; one hundred and five of this number I had the consolation of baptising myself.

The Feast of the Assumption will long be remembered by the Potawatomes. The church in which Mass was sung was perhaps the poorest in the world. Twelve neophytes, who three months before had no knowledge of God's laws, chanted the Mass in a most edifying manner. Father Verreydt preached upon devotion to the Blessed Virgin. I followed with an instruction upon the necessity of Baptism. I explained its ceremonies, and then administered the Sacrament to twenty adults, among whom was the wife of the great Chief.

It was among these same poor subjects that Father De Smet was to learn the self-denial and the mortification that would fit him for the greater tasks of the future. The shiftlessness and filth of the Indians often occasioned epidemics; some tribes had as many as a thousand sick and at such times the missionary was worn out in the works of corporal mercy, which however always bore abundant fruit in spiritual gain.

It was in his ministrations among these Potawatomes that Father De Smet first came in contact with those disastrous results of governmental treatment of these poor savages which were so often and so ruinously to undo the work of charity and religion and which have stained so terribly and so irrevocably with the blot of inhuman greed the annals of a nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. It is impossible to estimate at all justly the apostolic work of Father De Smet without having clearly before our minds this terrible drawback. Writing to the Superior of the Orphanage at Termonde, Father De Smet tells his own story:

The Government pays the Potawatomes \$50,000 annually for the land that was taken from them. With the payment of this money has come a following of thieves, drunkards, gamblers, counterfeiters; in a word, the dregs of the United States. They exploit the Indians and furnish them with quantities of whiskey! So long as he has a penny, the Indian will drink and gamble. . . . Under the influence of liquor their passions lead them into the grossest excesses, beginning with songs of joy and ending with howls and screams. Disputes and quarrels follow, then stabbing and head-smashing; finally murder is the crowning crime of these abominable outrages. The ground is strewn with the dead, and the living are horribly mutilated. With a drunken Indian about no one is safe, and many times my own life has been in danger,

Such a condition, repeated annually, must have been

at least a very great discouragement to the missionary, and we can well understand how it could undo the very best efforts of a lifetime. Father De Smet did what he could to redress the wrong, but was powerless. The government did indeed pass a law forbidding the introduction of liquor into the Indian Territory, but no agent respected the law, and brandy arrived in cargoes. Father De Smet wrote a strong letter to the Government at Washington denouncing this abuse as both criminal and illegal. Apparently little heed was given in high places to these complaints; and a few unworthy Americans looked on with satisfaction at the self-destruction of a race they detested, and the whites, undisturbed, continued their odious traffic. With the yearly arrival of the money, the same blackguards would return and the same scenes would be enacted. Let it be further remembered that these doings were not in remote days of a new nation without force or control. These were the events of the years from 1837 almost to the memory of living men, and preceded by barely a generation the scourging retribution of fratricidal war.

The guilt of these proceedings must be laid at the door of a nation of 17,000,000 that in material things was marching steadily on in the path of progress and prosperity. The pioneer marched ever westward, hewing, with fire and axe, a path through the virgin forests, weaving a trail in the tall grass of the prairies, and pitching his tent wherever he found agricultural land. The Indians, original possessors of the soil, beheld their domains diminishing continually. The Indian tribes transported from the country east of the Mississippi to the solitudes of the West carried with them an implacable hatred of the white man who had unjustly driven them from the tombs of their fathers and robbed them of their heritage. A great part of the redskins, however, continued their roaming life in the desert where the white man had not yet penetrated. Upon the banks of the

upper Missouri, in the territories of Nebraska, Wyoming, Dakota, and Montana, lived the great Sioux nation. Further North roamed the Black Feet, the Crows, and other tribes. Lastly, in the heart of the Rocky Mountains, and in the fertile valleys, watered by the tributaries of the Columbia River, gathered a large number of smaller tribes, strangers to the Missouri Indians and often victims of their incursions. These were the Flatheads and allied nations, and it was to these last tribes Father De Smet was henceforth to consecrate his ardent zeal and the resources of his great ability.

In the wise designs of Divine Providence he was at last prepared for his great lifework, and his call to the field now ready for sowing came from a race prepared in many ways to receive and bring to fruit the message of the Gospel. Thirty years before, a band of Catholic Iroquois crossed the Mississippi Valley and directed their steps to the unknown regions of the West. They carried with them the doctrines of the Catholic Faith, its beliefs, its prayers, and the memory of its ceremonies. They were welcomed by the Flatheads and soon through ties of marriage became members of that people. The leader of these Iroquois, Ignatius LaMousse, had been baptized and married in the true Faith and, as far as in him lay, became its apostle among the Flatheads.

Influenced by his teaching, the Flatheads as early as 1831 had despatched four of their tribe through the hostile country to St. Louis as a delegation to ask that a Black Robe be sent to their nation. Two of the deputation died in St. Louis and the two survivors set out for the Mountains, but never reached their tribe. In 1834 the Flatheads learned that a band of missionaries was en route to their tribe and they concluded it was the Black Robes for whom the messengers had gone. Priests, however, were so scarce that a new mission could not be started and the band ad-

vancing to the Flatheads in no way resembled those the Iroquois had told them about. They were married and they did not wear either the black robe or the crucifix, neither did they recite the "big prayer" (the Mass). These were not the masters they expected. The Methodists (for such they were), soon realizing that it was useless to remain, left shortly after to establish themselves in Oregon. Another attempt made a year later by the American Board of Foreign Missions met with no greater success. It would have been better had these zealots confined their efforts to bringing to a right mind the forces at work, under governmental connivance, in the horrible program of degrading the Indian tribes already in touch with the white man's rule.

Four years after the first deputation, despairing of seeing again their brothers who had gone on the earlier mission, the Flatheads decided to send a second message. This time Ignatius offered to go himself. Taking with him his two sons whom he wished to have baptized, he left the mountains in the summer of 1835. In December they reached St. Louis. Assured by Bishop Rosati that missionaries would be sent and cheered with this hope, Ignatius returned to his country. Eighteen months passed and yet no Black Robe arrived. In the summer of 1837 a third deputation consisting of three Flatheads, one Nez Percé, with their chief, old Ignatius, started for St. Louis. They were set upon and destroyed by a band of three hundred Sioux warriors. Upon learning this crushing news the poor Indians asked themselves if they would ever obtain a Catholic priest, but undaunted decided to send a fourth deputation to St. Louis. Two Iroquois who had some knowledge of French offered to go. In the middle of September, 1839, the deputation passed the St. Joseph Mission at Council Bluffs. They visited the mission which had been established the year before for the Potawatomes and there Father De Smet beheld for the first time those to whom he

would soon begin his apostolate. "With tears in their eyes," he said afterwards, "they begged me to return with them. Should God deem me worthy of the honor, I would willingly give my life to help these Indians." He had once offered to go to the Rocky Mountains and his superior, after withholding consent for some time, finally yielded to his importunities. His superior had intended giving him an assistant but the necessary money was not forthcoming, so he started alone with only young Ignatius as guide. They left St. Louis on March 27th, 1840, and across plain and desert, over mountains and by river, through a country filled with hostile savages they journeyed until, on June 30th, at Green River, they beheld approaching a group of Flatheads consisting of ten warriors, sent to escort the missionary to the camp. The Flatheads gave him the news of the tribe, recounting their victory over the Black Feet who had attempted to obstruct their passage; but the party had yet to traverse the most difficult part of the way. Before leaving Green River he spent some days among the Nez Percés, Spokanes, and the Cœur d'Alenes. All manifested a great desire to have a Black Robe among them. He saw here, for the first time, also, the Snakes, who were a much lower type, and the Yampah Utes, lowest of all. These two latter, very impoverished, lived in holes dug in the earth. They wore no clothes, and fed on the dead bodies of their relatives and even ate their children.

At this same place Father De Smet met among some Canadian hunters a compatriot, John Baptiste De Velder, a Fleming of Ghent. Enchanted to have found a Belgian nine thousand miles from his country, he generously offered to accompany the missionary and serve him during his journey. July 3rd was a Sunday. Father De Smet offered the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass at an altar erected upon elevated ground and decorated with wild flowers. This was the first time Mass had been said in the Rocky Mountains.

"I preached in French and English," writes the missionary, "to the American and Canadian hunters and then through an interpreter addressed the Flatheads and the Snakes. It was a consoling sight to see this cosmopolitan gathering following the sacred mysteries. The Canadians sang some hymns in French and Latin, while the Indians chanted in their own tongue. The service was truly Catholic." The next day the gathering dispersed. Accompanied by his faithful Fleming and the delegates from the Flatheads, Father De Smet continued his journey and finally arrived at the Indian camp. Father De Smet now tasted the purest joys of his apostolic life. He himself shall tell us of it:

The poles were already set up for my tent, and upon my arrival men, women and children, sixteen hundred souls in all, came to shake hands with me and bid me welcome. The old men cried for joy, and the children expressed gladness by gambols and screams of delight. These kind Indians conducted me to the tent of the great chief, a patriarchal person called Big Face, who, surrounded by his council, received me with great cordiality. "Black Robe," he said, "welcome to my nation. Our hearts rejoice, for to-day the Great Spirit has granted our petition. You have come to a people poor, plain, and submerged in the darkness of ignorance. I have always exhorted my children to love the Great Spirit. We know that all that exists belongs to Him and everything we have comes from His generous hands. From time to time kind white men have given us good advice, which we have striven to follow. Our ardent desire to be instructed in what concerns our salvation has led us on several occasions to send a deputation of our people to the Great Black Robe (the Bishop) of St. Louis to ask him to send a priest. Black Robe, speak! We are all your children. Show us the path we must follow to reach the place where abides the Great Spirit. Our ears are open, our hearts will heed your words! Speak, Black Robe! we will follow the words of your mouth!"

I then spoke at length to these good people upon the subject of religion. I told them the object of my mission, and asked them to give up their wandering life and settle in a fertile district. All declared themselves ready and willing to exchange the bow and arrow for the spade and the plow. I drew up a set of rules for the religious exercises. One of the chiefs immediately brought me a bell, and that first evening it called the Indians to assemble around my tent. After a short instruction, night prayers were said. Before retiring they sang in admirable harmony three hymns in praise of the Great Spirit of their own composition. No words can express how deeply I was touched.

The great chief was up every morning at daybreak. He would mount his horse and make the tour of the camp, haranguing his people. "Come," said he, "courage, my children! Tell Him you love Him, and ask Him to make you charitable! Courage, the sun is rising. Come, bathe in the river. Be punctual and at our Father's tent on the tap of the bell. Be still, open your ears to hear, and your hearts to retain the words he will speak."

When all were ready I rang the bell for prayers and instruction. From the day I arrived until I left the Flatheads their avidity to hear the word of God increased daily. I preached regularly four times a day, and each time they ran eagerly to secure good places. Those who were sick were carried to the sermons.

Father De Smet returned to the Flatheads in Pierre's Hole at the foot of the three Tetons. A few days later they broke camp and started north by slow stages. On July 22nd, the caravan attained the ridge which separates the watersheds of the Missouri from those of the Columbia River.

I climbed a high mountain [writes the missionary] in order to measure more accurately the distance of the source of these two rivers. I saw the stream descending from dizzy heights, leaping from rock to rock with a deafening noise. The two

large streams are formed at their source, with scarcely a hundred feet between them. I wished very much to get to the summit, but a five-hour climb had exhausted my strength. I reached, I think, a height of 5,000 feet, and after crossing masses of snow twenty feet deep I yet was far from the top.

Constrained to abandon my project, I seated myself and fell to thinking about the Jesuit Fathers who were serving the missions on the Mississippi from Council Bluffs to the Gulf of Mexico. The happy memories these thoughts awakened moved me to tears of joy. I thanked God for having deigned to bless the work of His servitors dispersed in this vast vineyard, and implored the grace for all the nations of Oregon, the Flatheads, and Pend d'Oreilles in particular, these last who had just enrolled themselves under the banner of Jesus Christ. Then I wrote in large letters upon the soft surface of the rock the following inscription: *Sanctus Ignatius Patronus Montium. Die Julii 23, 1840.* I said a Mass of Thanksgiving at the foot of this mountain, surrounded by my Indians, who chanted canticles of praise to God, and took possession of the country in the name of our holy founder.

The season was then far advanced, and the missionary was obliged to start at once in order to reach St. Louis before the winter set in.

With tears in their eyes the Indians wished me a good and safe journey. Old Big Face arose and said:

"Black Robe! may the Great Spirit accompany you on your long and dangerous journey. Morning and night we will pray that you may safely reach your brothers in St. Louis, and we will continue to pray thus until you return to your children of the mountains. When the snows of winter will have disappeared from the valleys, and when the first green of spring begins to appear, our hearts, which now are so sad, will once more rejoice. As the meadow grass grows higher and higher, we will go forth to meet you. Farewell, Black Robe, farewell."

The narrative of Father De Smet's return to St. Louis

continues the absorbing interest any reader will have felt in following his life. Adventure, peril, consolation, disappointment crowded his days and nights. Once at night after the missionary had retired and was about to fall asleep, he saw a chief, who had received him with much honor, enter his tent. Brandishing a knife that gleamed in the light of the torch he said: "Black Robe, are you afraid?" The missionary, taking the chief's hand, placed it on his breast and replied: "See if my heart beats more rapidly than usual! Why should I be afraid? You have fed me with your own hand and I am as safe in your tent as I would be in my father's house." Flattered by this reply, the Black Foot renewed his professions of friendship; he had wished only to test the confidence of his guest. He finally reached Council Bluffs by following the Missouri, filled at the time with floating ice, which continually jammed his frail canoe against snags. The following night the river froze over. He stayed a short time with Fathers Verreyet and Hoecken and his beloved Potawatomes. Finally, after nine months' journeying, he reentered St. Louis on New Year's eve.

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

HYMN OF A CENTURY

BY SISTER MARY ANTONELLA HARDY

"Hail to the Queen who reigns above,
Mother of clemency and love,
Hail thou, our hope, life, sweetness; we
Eve's banished children cry to thee.

"We, from this wretched vale of tears
Send sighs and groans unto thy ears;
Oh, then, sweet Advocate, bestow
A pitying look on us below.

"After this exile, let us see
Our blessed Jesus, born of thee.
O merciful, O pious Maid,
O gracious Mary, lend thine aid."

"Did Father Nerinckx make this translation of the *Salve Regina*?"

Many who have heard this hymn sung by the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross, have been in admiration of it. Throughout the years, copy after copy of words and music has been requested, especially by priests, and the question heading this article has time and again been asked. No one knew more than that it was called "Father Nerinckx' hymn", a title affectionately bestowed since he had adopted it for his spiritual children, the Sisters of Loretto, and made it an obligation of Rule to sing it at their morning and evening devotions. The Rule specifies, in part, for the morning: "A consideration is read on the Passion of our Lord, with the *Stabat Mater*, . . . one *Our Father* and *Hail Mary* for the Bishop and Missionaries of this Diocese, another for the welfare of the country and the Benefactors

of the Institute. The conclusion with the Antiphona: *Hail to the Queen*, sung." And it is again specified to be sung at the evening devotions.

From an article, "A Philadelphia Choir Book of 1787", by Monsignor H. T. Henry, Litt.D., begun in the September, 1915, issue of the "Records of the American Catholic Historical Society", a much desired light has been thrown upon the origin of the translation, or, at least, as to the time of its appearance. If Father Nerinckx did not obtain it from the Philadelphia Choir Book of 1787, he very probably got it from one of the various Primers, which Monsignor H. T. Henry mentions as furnishing translations of Latin hymns for Catholic use in England before 1787. These he could easily have obtained from his Reverend brother, John Nerinckx, who, an exile from Belgium because of the Revolution, was ordained in London in the year 1802.

Outside of the Rule, Father Nerinckx, by a Directory which he compiled for his spiritual children and in the instructions which he imparted to them at different times, gave detailed particulars concerning the various duties of the Religious. In his instruction to them on March 25, 1823, at Loretto, the Mother House, he is reported as saying:

Four Sisters shall be appointed as censors to watch the others, and see if they sing at the appointed times, and keep that holy rule which so much animates us to praise the Lord. Let all the Friends of Mary join in praising their sweet Saviour, some in sounding forth His praises with their voices, and others with their hearts. No one is allowed to sit in corners under pretence that she cannot sing.

We find recorded in his instruction to the Sisters at their branch house, Holy Mary's, Calvary, Kentucky, November 6, 1822: "The three oldest singers that are capable of lead-

ing the tunes, should take their tower¹ in the Chapel for a week at a time to lead the tunes."

SINGING SCHOOL AND SONG

(Father Nerinckx' Directory)

The Song in the Society is a necessary duty, a continual practice & a particular act of devotion, its nourishment and one of its sweet effects. It is for the school an help to piety, a pleasant recreation, a refreshment of zeal and an addition to education. These motives ought to make the necessary impression upon Superiors and Teachers, & should encourage Sisters and scholars that are blessed with voices to comply with this duty. If they have not the voice of mouth, their hearts may accompany; their little breath may blow while others give the sound; for God hears mighty sharp.

In singing, the hearts ought to be raised to God. That song is not good, says St. Bernard, whose tune pleases more than the words & their meaning. The beauty of the voice is sometimes the cause of vanity, when vain complacency takes place & turns devotion into sin.

The Society in song as well as in other performances and actions of life shall incline to humility, imitating their singing Mother MARY when she uttered her heavenly MAGNIFICAT.

RULES

1. There shall be in every house two teachers for the Song, who know the notes and have their tower of teaching.

2. Every day shall be half an hour singing-school for beginners, & half an hour at night performances for Community & school.

3. Four, or surely two, will be designed to strike the hymns in the chapel.

4. The teachers ought to be acquainted with songs for their schools.

1 Father Nerinckx no doubt had in mind the French word *tour*, meaning "turn".

5. No new songs nor new tunes to be brought in, besides those now in use at Loretto—the Gregorian or plain song for Mass may be learned—the Lady's Song or *Magnificat* must be sung once every day, twice on Saturdays, & twice on Sundays & holydays; the time to sing this when all together at prayers, Mass or evening-song. (Note: In an instruction April 23, 1823, Father Nerinckx is recorded as saying: "The *Magnificat* need not be sung at Mass every time that anyone Communicates, but only on days of general Communion.")

6. If one of the Sisters or Society, able to sing, does not do it, she must acknowledge her fault and say five Our Fathers and Hail Marys; if used to it, do public penance.

7. A sign will be given when blunders are making or slumber observed, or want of zeal in the time of singing; this to the charge of the oldest Cantress, that is, the appointed singer.

8. A distinction should be made for songs of common days, Sundays & feasts. Also for High Mass & private; taking habits, vows, & making First Communion. Times of beginning & stopping in solemn & private Masses—three tunes allowed according to quality of the services: tenor, treble & bass.

9. Never music or any instruments.

THE SONGS OF LORETTO

1. The holy name of JESUS.
JESUS the only thought of Thee.
2. The Incarnation of the Son of God.
O Sion, sing the wondrous Love.
3. The Nativity of our Lord.
With hearts truly grateful.
4. Another upon the same.
Whilst Angels to the world.
5. Another.
Sion rejoice, let joyful songs.
6. Desire of loving God.
O power divine! O charity.

7. Confidence in God.
Through all the changing.
8. A song of praise to God.
Grateful notes & numbers.
9. Return of a dissipated soul to God.
Where have my wandering senses.
10. The happy effects of the love of Jesus.
Jesus, Lover of my soul.
11. Another.
Graces from my Jesus flowing.
12. Adoration of the B. Sacrament.
Saving Host, we fall before.
13. Aspiration before Communion.
My God, my life, my Love.
14. Another.
I hear a charming voice.
15. Aspiration in Communion.
Delightful moment, happy hour.
16. Aspiration after Communion.
What happiness can equal mine.
17. A song of praise to God.
O praise ye the Lord.
18. The Lord's Day.
Welcome, sweet day of rest.
19. Farewell to the world.
No longer shall my soul confide.
20. Contemplation of Heaven.
Come, let us lift our joyful eyes.
21. In Lent.
O bountiful Creator! hear.
22. In Passion time.
Behold the Royal Ensign fly.

23. At Easter.
Young men and maids.
24. Another at Easter.
Sion rejoice! Let joyful songs.
25. An invitation to praise God.
Sing ye praises to the Lord.
26. Salve Regina.
Hail to the Queen.
27. Ave Maria.
Hail Mary Queen & Virgin pure.
28. An address to the Virgin Mary for the conversion of
those who are in error.
O Mother of the light.
29. Antiphona to the Blessed Virgin.
O holy Mother of our God.
30. The Stabat Mater.
Under the world's redeeming wood.
31. For the beginning of Mass.
With trembling awe.
32. At All Saints for the Souls; or the *Dies Irae*.
That day of wrath! that dreadful.
33. Invocation of the Holy Ghost.
Come, Holy Ghost, send down.
34. The Veni Creator Spiritus.
Spirit Creator of mankind.
35. The sinner's return to God.
Lord, my sins lie heavy on.
36. A funeral song on death.
Death is our doom.
37. A hymn at Vespers.
Sing, O my tongue, adore &.
38. For the Feast of a Martyr.
O God, the lot, the crown.

39. A morning hymn.
Now night descends the.
40. To Jesus in the B. Sacrament.
O Jesu Deus Magne.
O Salutaris Hostia.
O quam suavis est.
Adoro te devote latens deitas.
The Litanies of Our Lady
& the Saints.
The Magnificat.
Lord Jesus! have mercy.
The Sanctus.
The Agnus Dei.

And whatever may be found in graduals or Antiphonals.

NOTE.—The Teachers ought to have a minute of this.

Father Nerinckx' injunction that no new songs nor new tunes—"besides those now in use at Loretto"—be brought in, was a wise provision against the introduction of non-Catholic words and music. Unconscious he must have been of the certain Protestant authorship of "Through all the changing scenes of life", and the same authorship suspected of "While Angels to the world proclaim", "Sing ye praises to the Lord", and "O praise ye the Lord".

Father Nerinckx' restriction, "Never music or any instruments", was very probably directed against the violin, so much used in connection with the dances of that period—not certainly against the pipe organ, since he has the distinction, together with that of having brought to Kentucky the first stoves, of having introduced here the first pipe organ, a splendid instrument for that day and now in possession of the Sisters of Loretto at their Mother House. This organ was made in Paris, France, and placed by Father Nerinckx in Bardstown Cathedral, where the Right Reverend John B. David was organist. Later it was bought

by the Sisters of Loretto at Calvary, for many years used in the Calvary church, and in 1899 brought to Loretto, where it is used in the orchestra of the Academy.

The office of "striking" the tunes, especially of *Hail to the Queen*—difficult because of its minor key—was religiously fulfilled but not sought, and so much did it prey upon the mind of the one appointed that many amusing incidents are related of timid Novices who on being jostled to arouse them from the drowsiness that had overcome them at meditation hour, would discordantly break upon the prayerful quiet with the intonation, "Hail to the Queen"! The setting of the hymn—the same as that given in the Philadelphia Choir Book of 1787—was used by the Sisters until 1849, at which time an easier melody in major key and three-fourths time, was adopted. This melody, which they use to the present day, is almost note for note that of the *Dona nobis pacem* of Bishop David's Mass (see "The Catholic Melodist", published in 1855, by Webb, Gill & Levering, Louisville, Ky.), also in some old hand-copied music done by Loretines is found the same melody used for the Easter hymn, "*Ad regias Agni dapes*": The Red Sea's dangers now are past. To which of these three uses of the air is due the right of priority is not now known.

In the Directory compiled by Father Nerinckx, we find also the following provision for the singing of *Hail to the Queen* at midnight:

THE PRINCIPAL FEASTS OF OUR LADY.

They are Immaculate Conception, most holy Nativity, most wondrous Annunciation, and her most glorious Assumption.

Waking at quarter before 12 the bell rings while 12 Hail Marys are said.

At 12 o'clock: nine Glorys,

Hail Daughter, &c.,

Then *Hail to the Queen*,

The Litany of our Lady,

Hail Mary Queen,

Nine Glorys,

The *Sanctus*,

Four Our Fathers, &c., in honor of St. Joachim, St.

Anna, St. Joseph, & St. John Evangelist,

One verse of the *Veni Creator*,

Three verses of Jesus, the only thought,

Nine Glorys,

Finish with the *Angelus*.

At the Feast of the Annunciation:

Beginning and ending with the *Angelus*—kneeling.

These Mysteries so much interesting the Society are supposed to have happened at midnight.

But perhaps the most interesting of all these extracts from Father Nerinckx' Directory is the following:

THE SENDING TO A NEW ESTABLISHMENT

A procession on the Sunday before the journey.

1. All the nominated come to the Mother House three days before the start.

2. A retreat of nine days, at the end of which the Mother is installed and offices designated in the workroom after advices. This done, the Litany is sung in the Chapel, then recreation; the rest of the time is spent in fixing for the journey.

3. The day of starting: High Mass early, in which Communion for the travelers, Dear Mother and the rest disposed for Communion.

4. All things being ready beforehand, after breakfast they all go to the Chapel, say the Lady's Litany, adore the Blessed Sacrament, hail the Blessed Virgin, go in the refectory, embrace their Sisters with a farewell. Then on their knees re-

ceive the blessing of the new Mother, Dear Mother and the Mother of Loretto standing. Then, all in the Chapel, invite the Lord Jesus, the dear Mother Mary for company, with all the Saints and Angel Guardians of the Society, bidding rest to the departed; go in silence into the wagon from the Chapel, which starting, they strike *Hail to the Queen*.

5. On the road all Rules kept as much as possible; the Sacred Heart picture and the Loretto picture carried in sight. When arrived at the place, the adoration of the B. Sacrament and *Hail to the Queen* sung, they kiss the ground on which they are to work for God's glory, to live and die, &, if there be a grave-yard, plant the cross, & dig three spades. Recreation the third day.

"Hailing" the Blessed Virgin has reference to another point of Loretine Rule, which instructs the Sisters to begin and end all their community prayers with the indulgenced greeting used in the Holy House of Loretto, namely: "Hail Daughter of God the Father!, Hail Mother of God the Son!, Hail Spouse of God the Holy Ghost!, Hail Temple of the Blessed Trinity!"

The "Picture of the Sacred Heart" which, together with the "Loretto Picture", was to be carried in sight, is one that Father Nerinckx had made in Mechlin in 1816. It bears the mark, "*Gravé par Courtais en Malines*". He designed it specially for the Society; it represents our Lord on the cross, consumed in the flames of His burning Heart. "Little Loretto" is seen at the foot of the "Calvary", small hearts mounting upwards toward the open Wound represent the souls of those leaving the world to enter the Loretto cloister, while around the spear-pierced heart of the Sorrowful Mother in the open Wound are clustered the hearts of the Loretine religious. This picture, on the reverse side of which Father Nerinckx wrote the "Morning Manna" of the Society:

122a



"LORETTO PICTURE"

Designed by Father Nerinckx, and engraved in Europe in 1816
(See page 123)

"O Dear Sisters and scholars!

Love your Jesus, dying with love for you on the Cross!

Love Mary, your loving Mother, sorrowing at the foot of the cross!

Love one another, have only one heart, one soul, one mind!

Love the Institute, love the Rules, love Jesus' darling humility!"

was placed on the Epistle side of the altar, the celebrating priest would read aloud the "Manna", and the Superior, representing the Sisters, and the eldest pupil, the school, would come up to the altar-railing and kiss the image of the Sacred Heart.

The "Loretto picture" was also designed by Father Nerinckx and likewise done in Europe in 1816. The first building on the left is Father Nerinckx' own dwelling and is still preserved on the grounds at the Mother House. The worthy historian, John Gilmary Shea, writing April 25, 1891, to a Sister of Loretto, says:

Many thanks . . . for the delightful old view of the Convent of Loretto. It is so quaint and odd that it deserves a place among queer pictures. They tell a story of an officer of the English army in India who, having been sent with a detachment into a new part of the country near the mountains, thought that a sketch of the new fort and its surroundings would interest friends in England. So he prepared a careful sketch and sent it to the London Illustrated News. He received by return mail a letter of thanks, but when the paper arrived, to his horror and the intense enjoyment of all his fellow officers the whole picture had been filled up with palm-trees, when in fact there was not a tree of any kind in sight from the fort. It was in vain for him to protest that his sketch had not been followed, he was the butt of all regimental jokes. When he wrote to London complaining indignantly of the liberty taken with his drawing, they replied that the English public required palm trees in pictures from India! The Belgian engraver seems to have had the same idea.

"And if there be a grave-yard, they plant the cross and dig three spades." It was formerly a Loretine custom for

the community to go to the grave-yard on every first Monday of the month after the recitation of the *Dies Irae* and for each member to dig a spadeful of earth from the grave destined for the Sister who might be next to die. This custom, faithfully kept at the Mother House until 1896, was thereafter discontinued, as it could not be generally practised in the Society.

The term "Dear Mother", appearing in the quotation, was the title given to the "Generalissima".

A certain "sending to a new establishment" proved one of the most pathetic that pen has ever recorded, resulting in the death from fright of one of the Sisters. We shall not here repeat the story which, at every re-reading, gives forth a new aroma of spiritual beauty. We refer our readers to the Life of Father Nerinckx by Bishop Maes, or to the Annals of Loretto by Anna C. Minogue. The Annals states in part:

In 1867 three Sisters started for Santa Fe, traveling from St. Louis with Bishop Lamy, Father D. M. Gasparri, S.J., two other Jesuit Fathers and two Sisters of Charity. On Friday, June 14th, the caravan left Leavenworth, Kansas, reaching St. Mary's, at that time a reservation of the Pottawattomie Indians, on the 21st. From that point on the party was more or less beset by savages, who, however, showed no indication of fighting until the evening of the 17th of July, when fifty of them suddenly appeared and began their attack on the caravan.

We learn from the History of the Sisters of Charity, of Leavenworth, published in 1898, that there were twenty-six in the party and that the Indian fight lasted three hours—"bullets flying around the canvass of the Sister's wagon and arrows piercing it until it was covered with them." Six days later the party was again set upon by the Indians, the terrorizing situation lasting throughout the entire night. The five Sisters remained in a tent, tortured by fears more

agonizing than their defenders could dream of, and fervently they prayed for death before falling into the hands of the maddened savages. "Drenched with rain and holding down the poles of their tent, the poor Sisters sang a hymn." (This from the Leavenworth History.) *What* hymn the historian does not tell us, but those Western winds surely caught these words, as they ascended from sorely tried hearts :

"We from this wretched vale of tears
Send sighs and groans unto thy ears;
Oh, then, sweet Advocate, bestow
A pitying look on us below!"

Many of these temporary directions of Father Nerinckx, which he gave as suited to that particular period, were discontinued long years ago, but that point of Rule which required the singing, night and morning, of *Hail to the Queen*, the Sisters have faithfully kept throughout the century. So earnest are they in their desire for the fulfillment of this ardent wish of their holy Founder, that some not blessed with voice have prayed for that gift if only they might sing this hymn with the community. It is considered very unworthy of a Loretine to be dilatory in this pious exercise, while the sick desire not to be dispensed from it. At the present time there is in the Loretine house of Santa Fé, New Mexico—Academy of Our Lady of Light—an aged Religious who has been sixty-seven years in the Order, and who, now no longer able to go to the Chapel, sings alone, in her own little room, at her early rising hour of about three o'clock in the morning, the loved "*Salve*". At Loretto Heights Academy, Loretto, Colorado, where are taken for burial the remains of those members who die in the cities of Denver and Colorado Springs, the Sisters, in file on either side of the front entrance await the arrival of the hearse, and greet the remains of their

sacred dead with the age-used hymn to their Heavenly Mother. With special fervor is the hymn sung on occasions of Reception and Profession, and on the splendid occasion of the Order's Centenary, in 1912, it was made a special feature in the celebration of each House, while the Religious of the Mother House and local houses of Kentucky made a pilgrimage to the site of "Little Loretto", and sang with heartfelt gratitude on the very spot where their cradle was first rocked, the hymn their Father taught them, that has ever been their consolation in the long ascent to "Calvary", that, though old, to them ever younger and sweeter grows:

"Hail to the Queen who reigns above!"

NOTE.—Through Dr. H. Grattan Flood it is learned that this translation of the *Salve Regina* is in the Primer (London) of 1685. (See RECORDS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY, Vol. XXVI, No. 4.)—S. M. A.

REVEREND CHARLES NERINCKX.¹

BY THE REV. JOSEPH J. MURPHY, J. C. D.

No apology is needed for a new biography of Reverend Charles Nerinckx, the famous pioneer missionary of Kentucky and founder of the Congregation of the Sister of Loretto in that State. Bishop Maes had already written an extensive biography and several minor sketches had appeared, but there is ample room for the present volume which conveys much new information, based on recently discovered documents. The life story of Father Nerinckx is most interesting, almost fascinating, and the present lengthy review is given in the hope of leading our readers to secure this volume and learn the difficult conditions that confronted the pioneer missionaries of a century ago in our own land.

Charles Nerinckx was born in Herffelingen, in Brabant, 2 October, 1761, the eldest of a family of fourteen children. He studied philosophy at Louvain and theology at Mechlin, where he was ordained, 1 November, 1785. After spending eight years as assistant at the Mechlin Cathedral he was appointed pastor of Meerbeek, a country town midway between Brussels and Louvain. The times were far from peaceful and then, as now, Belgium was the battlefield of Europe. He writes: "At Mechlin, the previous year (1793), I suffered from the first invasion of the French, and the day after my installation at Meerbeek the

¹ *Life of Rev. Charles Nerinckx, Pioneer Missionary of Kentucky and Founder of the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross*, by Rev. W. J. Howlett. 1915. Mission Press, Techny, Ill.

second invading army reached my parish . . . the French took possession of the country, and I was forced to flee from my house in the dress of a layman, and seek refuge in various houses for about three weeks" (p. 33). The infiltration of French revolutionary ideas and the general laxity of morals made his priestly work difficult, but his unceasing labors, particularly with the children, had begun to show promising results, when (17 October, 1797) his refusal to subscribe to the schismatical oath required by the French government led to his banishment from his parish. The next few years were spent in hiding in the diocese of Ghent, where he acted as Chaplain to the nuns who directed the hospital. His name was placed on the list of fugitives from justice, and death or exile would be the penalty if he were apprehended. Under these circumstances, as a return to his parish was out of the question, his thoughts turned to America, and 20 September, 1803, he wrote to Bishop Carroll, offering his services for the American missions. His application, endorsed by the mother of the Reverend Demetrius Gallitzen, was favorably received. Nine days' journey on foot and two by water took him to Amsterdam, whence he set sail for Baltimore, where he arrived after a three months' voyage, 14 November, 1804.

After spending several months at Georgetown College, he was appointed by Bishop Carroll as assistant to Father Badin, who had labored in the Kentucky missions since his ordination in 1793. He joined Father Badin at St. Stephen's, thirteen miles from Bardstown, 2 July, 1805. The parish boundaries were: "Florida and Louisiana on the south, the Mississippi on the west, Detroit on the north, and the Alleghanies to the east" (p. 104). The residence of the missionaries was a small cabin of two rooms, and from this as a centre there were eighteen stations to be visited at stated times and numerous other smaller places

to be visited as occasion permitted. Here he remained for seven years, and then removed to Hardin's Creek. "Often he was known to ride twenty-five or thirty miles fasting in order to be able to say Mass. . . . He crossed wilderness districts, swam rivers, slept in the woods among the wild beasts. . . . He often arrived at a distant station early in the morning after having ridden during all the previous night" (p. 121). The following winter was completely taken up by a general visitation of the missions by the two priests, and later Father Nerinckx was given charge of the settlements located east of their home church. He writes in a letter: "On the 15th of November, 1805, just one year after my arrival in America I had the happiness of laying the corner-stone of Holy Mary's Church. . . . The church will cost about \$400.00, which I intend to pay in trade" (p. 138). In another letter he gives some interesting details of his activities: "We have some twenty-four missions to attend. The most remote church is sixty miles from here, but we are sometimes called as far as 180 miles in either direction. . . . I have traveled a hundred and fifty miles on horseback in two nights and one day, through bad roads and all kinds of weather. . . . My usual occupations during the week are: On Sunday I am in the saddle at about four o'clock, so as to reach one of my missions at about half past six. I there find a crowd of people awaiting my coming to go to confession. We first say the prayers for morning and make a meditation. I then give them an instruction on the sacrament of penance and prepare them for it. At intervals of half an hour, marked by the ringing of a bell . . . one of the congregation says the beads for a special intention already determined, and so on until about eleven o'clock, when I vest for Mass. Before beginning the Holy Sacrifice I give a short address, and I preach after the reading of the Gospel. After Mass I have the children pray for special intentions. The congregation is dismissed

between one and two P. M., when I am ready for baptisms and funerals, if there should be any. Seldom do I break my fast before four o'clock, unless to take a glass of water or milk, and it often happens that when I have had a bite someone is ready to take me twenty miles or more on a sick call " (p. 140).

The Maryland Catholics who settled in Kentucky, as a rule, brought with them no traditions of generosity towards the Church (Bishop Spaulding's explanation of this peculiar condition is quoted, pp. 150-153), so that Father Nerinckx was forced to apply to his friends in Belgium to aid him in building and furnishing the new churches. It is estimated that he received over \$15,000.00 in money and church supplies from abroad, so that he was amply justified when he said: "I can truly say that I alone have contributed more to the church than the four or five hundred families under my care taken together" (p. 150). Nevertheless he managed to erect more than ten churches, including the first brick Catholic church in Kentucky at Danville.

In 1808, he refused, despite the repeated solicitation of Bishop Carroll, the office of Apostolic Administrator of New Orleans. On the second Sunday of Lent of the following year he established the first Holy Name Society in America, at St. Charles' Church, Hardin's Creek, Marion County (p. 222). Soon after the arrival of Bishop Flaget in Bardstown, 11 June, 1811, a conference of the five secular and four Dominican priests—the entire clerical body of Kentucky—was held for the purpose of distributing the diocese into missionary districts with defined limits. To Father Nerinckx was assigned practically half the state of Kentucky, with residence at St. Charles in a "little log cabin of one room that served him as study, sleeping-room and dining-room". The following year he was able to lay the first foundations of the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross. The author gives an interesting account of

the early days of the order, of their struggles and the constant care of their founder, who never rested until the rule had been approved by the Holy See. An old Sister gives the following word-picture: "Father Abell walked into the room where the sisters were eating from tin plates, two to each plate, taking turns with the single knife and fork to help herself to a portion of the cabbage or potatoes, with a slice of bacon fried or boiled, which comprised their usual dinner. Each had a tin cup, filled with some dark-colored beverage called coffee, but which in reality was boiling water that had been poured over some burnt crusts of bread but not a grain of the aromatic plant was present" (p. 382).

Father Nerinckx made two visits to Europe to secure priests and sisters for the work of the diocese, and also furnishings for the churches. On his first visit, in 1815, he had published a pamphlet: "A Glance at the Present Condition of the Roman Catholic Religion in North America", an excellent résumé of the progress made in the spread of the faith in America. He states: "The population of the United States is between seven and eight millions, and among these there are about 300,000 Catholics" (p. 278). "Kentucky contains about 14,000 Catholics . . including the Bishop, the whole number of priests in this diocese is 12. . . . Tennessee has no priests. . . . Ohio has no priest. . . . Michigan has one priest at Detroit. . . Indiana has no priest. . . . Illinois Territory has two priests" (pp. 282-283).

After his return from his second trip to Europe, during which he persuaded Father De Smet to devote his life to the American mission to the Indians of the Far West, he remained near Loretto for a short while. He left there 16 June, 1824, and scarcely two months later breathed his last at St. Genevieve, Missouri, in the sixty-third year of his age.

Such are the salient features of the strenuous missionary career of this saintly pioneer. In the volume under review, the Rev. W. J. Howlett tells the complete story with marked sympathy and affection for the memory of Father Nerinckx. The liberal extracts from the writings of Father Nerinckx are a specially valuable feature of the book, which contains numerous interesting illustrations and an index. A map, showing the location of the various missions, would be a desirable addition to an otherwise complete and highly interesting book.

AN OLD-TIME CONTROVERSY.

Translation of the Latin Letters Exchanged between the Reverend
Jonathan Ashley, of Deerfield, Massachusetts and the
Reverend Jean Baptiste De Saint Pé, S. J.,
of Quebec and Montreal, 1748-1753.

EDITED BY THE REV. JOSEPH J. MURPHY, J. C. D.

EDITOR'S NOTE.

Some five years ago the late Mr. Martin I. J. Griffin discovered the following interesting correspondence in the Carnegie Book of manuscripts in the Congregational Library of Boston, Massachusetts. Through the courtesy of the Librarian, Mr. William H. Cobb, a transcription of these documents was made and purchased by the American Catholic Historical Society. The correspondence consists of six letters: one written by the Reverend Mr. Ashley and five by the Reverend Father Saint Pé. These six letters are written in Latin. The style of Father Saint Pé is fluent and even elegant, while Reverend Mr. Ashley's letter indicates that its author was no less a novice in Latin than he admits to be the case with the French tongue. Owing to this fact, doubtless, his letter consists rather of brusque assertions than reasoned arguments. It is to be regretted that Reverend Mr. Ashley's replies to Father Saint Pé have not been preserved; however, their general tenor, and frequently the very wording, can be gleaned from Father Saint Pé's letters. The original letter of Father Saint Pé, written in French, is likewise missing.

Together with the transcription, Mr. Cobb furnished a translation of the correspondence. This translation has

been carefully revised by the Editor, who, in addition to making several necessary corrections and emendations for the sake of greater precision, has also given the Scriptural quotations from the Douay version and, in several places, for the convenience of the reader, has inserted the wording of a text which was simply referred to by the writer.

One thing will strike the Catholic reader as remarkable, namely, that the accusations which the Reverend Mr. Ashley made against Catholic faith and practice in his day are identically the same as those proposed by non-Catholics to-day. In fact, were it not for the dates appended to these letters, one might reasonably conclude that the controversy belonged to the present year of grace instead of the years 1747-1753. Can it be that these comparatively trivial objections are the entire stock in trade of our militant separated brethren, and that, like the solitary case of Galileo with the critics of the Roman Congregations, they must perforce continue to do yoeman service from generation to generation?

I. LETTER.

REV. JONATHAN ASHLEY TO REV. JEAN BAPTISTE DE SAINT
PÉ, S.J.

TO THE SUPERIOR OF THE JESUITS
IN THE COLLEGE AT QUEBEC:

Your letter, received through Mr. Hawks, was very pleasing to me, but yet, as I am a novice in French, I did not have the pleasure of reading it until it was translated into English. It will be most agreeable to me and to others if all alienation of feeling shall be uprooted from our minds and we shall often exchange letters.

Sir, we return thanks again and again to the people of Canada for repeated favors to our friends. Mr. Hawks has spoken very often and very fully of the generosity extended last winter to him and to the rest. Your Governor and other

State officials have shown themselves most compassionate and liberal; I pray God, the Supreme Goodness, that they and you all may be abundantly recompensed.

I greatly rejoice in the cessation of war, in the hope of a well-established peace. I trust that the effusion of human blood is about to cease forever and that the time is now to come when nations shall no further stir up war, and they shall turn the swords to plowshares. Long has the sound of engines of war overwhelmed the cheering sound of the Gospel. But, God willing, Christ shall now be King of kings and Lord of lords, and the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of God.

Sir, I still desire that you and I should be of the same opinion in religious matters; but I cannot embrace a union of opinion by returning to the church of Rome; nor do the arguments you present to me constrain me to return to your church. It is true that Christ has had a church from His day to our day, and always will have to the end of time; but yet it is not always in the same part of the world. Once it was at Jerusalem, but now it has been given up to be trodden under foot. There were seven churches of Asia; at present they cannot be found: formerly the church of Christ was at Rome in the days of the Apostles, but now it is not the same church. Christ has had a church, and now has a church, in Great Britain, but I fear it will not be called so hereafter. Your church, it seems, was founded rather on the Pope than on Christ or the Apostles. The Pope assumes greater authority than Christ; Christ's laws are binding no further than as they please him (the Pope). I see many things in the Roman church, and in the established church of Britain, very offensive to me. Indulgences, holy water, prayers directed to the spirits of dead saints, prayers for the dead, with many other things not found in the holy scriptures, are in your church; in the state church of Britain the king is head, not the Pope; and there are many other things not so very unlike the trivialities in the church of Rome. While so great stumbling-blocks remain in the church of Rome and in the church of Britain, I shall hold aloof from both; but if these things, not found in

holy scripture, are rejected by your church, I shall willingly embrace your communion and worship.

Christ is the only king and law-giver in the church; and it is the height of arrogance for any man to claim the power of making laws in the church, or of changing the laws given by Christ (Rev. 22: 18, 19). Holy Scripture is the sole and perfect rule of faith (2 Tim. 3: 15-16), and needs not the uncertain traditions of men.

Sir, though there be discordance of opinion between us, let there be no diversity in love, but let love be fervent. Sir, the time for writing is brief; I was not aware, until just now, of an opportunity to send a letter; I must cease, and I close with best wishes for you and your Order. Sir, I am your most humble and obedient servant,

J. ASHLEY.

At Deerfield, February 25, 1748 (March 7, 1748, n. s.).

P. S. I shall eagerly await a letter from you.

II. LETTER.

REV. J. B. DE SAINT PÉ TO REV. JONATHAN ASHLEY.

MY MOST HONORED SIR:

The peace of Christ be with you.

I could not reply sooner to your most obliging letter. For some months, in fact, I have had such a bodily weakness that while I did not take to my bed, yet I was ill, and, besides other discomforts, a trembling hand hardly, and indeed not even hardly, at first permitted me to guide a pen properly, and even now I find it an effort. Still I will try to answer somehow.

But passing by the good things which you in your kindness too courteously lavish on me, and which I recall with lively and most grateful feelings in my heart, I come at once without further preface to the matter of greater, nay of greatest, import which we are discussing.

God is my witness, Reverend Sir, how I long for you in the bowels of Jesus Christ, and how much I desire that, as

the Apostle so often enjoins, we may all believe, think, speak the same thing, and that there may be in us all one faith, even as there is one baptism and one God. But from my inmost heart I am grieved because that most excellent and also most effective argument concerning the Church seems to have lost all its force with you. I could not wonder enough at this, were I not aware that the things which the Lord Jesus, the very Truth Itself, brought forward in proof of His divinity were powerless among unbelievers. Pondering this, I have almost a mind to make an end of writing at the very beginning. For who am I to add rays to the Light, or to make the sun shining in full splendor visible to one who either has not the eyes of his heart enlightened (Eph. 1:18), or, which be it far from me to believe, knowingly and wilfully closes them to the light (Acts 28:27). Still I will proceed as far as the Lord gives me to go, lest, while most desirous for your eternal salvation, I should seem to have neglected any means in my power to procure it.

But even now, as I write, something better occurs to my mind—by God's inspiration, if I mistake not—namely, to send you this little book,¹ which if you read diligently, with due prayer beforehand, with an attentive mind and docile heart, with a real and sincere desire of apprehending the truth, I have no doubt that by the operation of the grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and with your own co-operation, you will be convinced, and persuaded, and converted, and return to your mother in Christ, the bride of that same Christ, namely, the true, holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and likewise Roman Church, to which singly and alone pertain (let other churches will or nil it) all those marks which distinguish and separate the true church from false ones. Take it therefore and read it. Meanwhile, though I am sending you a Compendium, I proceed more compendiously to answer in passing some of your more serious objections, if, indeed, any are serious.

¹ The name of this book does not appear. The play on words,—compendium and compendiously,—suggests that the title began with the word "compendium."

I begin with what you allege from Apoc. 22: 18-19 (*"If any man shall add to these things, God shall add to him the plagues written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life"*), and 2 Tim. 3: 15-16 (*"Because from thy infancy thou hast known the holy scriptures, which can instruct thee to salvation. . . . All scripture, inspired of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice"*), to prove that Holy Scripture is the only and perfect rule of faith. But we refute and reply in this manner:

1. John, in the passage cited, forbids the addition of anything to the Apocalypse *as a part of that prophecy*, but he does not forbid us to believe as certain by faith anything that is not written in that prophecy; else every other part of Holy Scripture would have to be set aside.

2. We answer that the text from Paul so approves the *profitableness* of Holy Scripture, which we own to be very great, as not to exclude the profitableness, nay, the necessity, of apostolic tradition.

3. We answer that not every tradition is to be rejected, and that this truth is proved by the testimonies of John and Paul. For

(a) John, near the close of his second and third Epistle, testified that many things remained for him to write which he would not write by means of paper, ink and pen, and which, therefore, he reserved to be handed down orally and to be set forth either for faith or conduct.

(b) The same Apostle thus ends his written Gospel: *"But there are also many other things which Jesus did; which, if they were written every one, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written"* (John 21: 25). Therefore something can be known about the Lord Jesus which was not written in the sacred books, provided that something has been handed down faithfully.

(c) Paul (1 Cor. 11: 34) promises that when present he will determine some things which he does not write: *"And the rest I will set in order, when I come."* The same Paul

(2 Thes. 2:14) gives the injunction: "*Hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle,*" where I would have you notice that the name of tradition is applied to scripture itself, for the reason now to be adduced.

4. For we answer that the very contents of the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament belonged to oral or vocal tradition before they were Scripture. For the Gospel was promulgated by the voice of the Apostles before it was committed to writing, for "*Faith cometh by hearing*" (Romans 10:17), and it is *not* said, "*Their writings came into all the earth*", but, "*Their sound hath gone forth into all the earth, and their words into the ends of the whole world*" (Romans 10:18).

5. We answer that, though the word of God be written ever so fully and sufficiently, there remain to be known two necessary things, which cannot be established save through apostolic tradition. One is, what belongs to Sacred Scripture and what does not? The other is, what is the genuine sense of Sacred Scripture, especially where there occur: "*Certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, to their own destruction*", as Peter admonishes (2 Peter 3:16).

We reply, finally, that certain things in faith and practice are held by your own selves which are not written in the sacred codices. For example, where in the world, I ask, is it written, and yet it is your custom, that Sunday should be devoted to divine worship in place of the Sabbath day, which the Lord in the decalogue had commanded to be kept holy? How will you answer this question, unless you answer with us, that it is evident from apostolic tradition that Sunday was substituted for the Sabbath day by Christ the Lord? And the case is similar in many other things.

It seems now that I ought to reply to these words of your letter: "Christ is the only king and lawgiver in the church, and it is the height of arrogance for any man to assume the power of making laws in the church, or of changing the laws given by Christ". Thus far you and your adherents. But our reply is as follows:

1. We deny with you that any one possesses the power of

changing laws established by Christ, or of making laws contrary to the laws of Christ. But we mildly ask of you what laws, and when, contrary to the laws of Christ has the Roman Church either made or allowed? When I say the Roman church, pray observe that I understand, and would have you understand, all, morally speaking (that is, the great majority), the pastors of that church whom "*the Holy Ghost hath placed (as) bishops to rule the church of God*" (Acts 20:28).

2. We freely confess that it is the height of arrogance if any one assumes to himself the power of making laws in the church before he receives that power from Christ, either immediately, or mediately through the church. For it is written: "*Neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God*" (Heb. 5:4). Hence we cannot wonder enough at the audacity of Luther, Calvin, and Henry VIII, whom you do not deny to have been leaders of your Reformation, as you deem it, and who it is not in the least probable were "called by God" to reform the church. Nay, we demand of the ministers of the churches that have separated from our own and that have gone off, and are daily going off, into countless divisions, as though diverging into so many radii from the centre of catholic unity,—we demand of them, I say, what proof do they offer of their calling and apostolate? They can offer none: neither a legitimate succession reaching down from Christ, nor miracles, nor anything else; and yet they have passed laws, set up church discipline, etc.

3. We confess with you and we ourselves contend, that Christ is the sole king and the supreme lawgiver in the church, yet so that we at the same time believe, what I am just about to prove, that a vicar has been appointed by Christ the King to rule on earth visibly the church militant, in the name of the invisible Christ, to interpret the laws laid down by Christ, to preside over the other judges in the church, i. e. the bishops, when the laws of Christ need interpretation, when there is need of defining what teaching conforms to Christ's teaching, what conduct harmonizes with Christ's laws.

You persist, most esteemed Sir, and say: "Your church, it seems, was founded rather on the Pope than on Christ or the

apostles; the Pope assumes greater authority than Christ; the laws of Christ are of no wider obligation than it may please him (the Pope)." I answer with the Catholics:

1. The Church is founded primarily on Christ, concerning which Paul says (1 Cor. 3:11): "*For other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid; which is Christ Jesus*". Nevertheless, according to the same apostle (Eph. 2:20), we are "*built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone*". And so, according to the apostle, there is a twofold foundation for the church: in the first place, Christ; in the second place, the apostles. Of these the chief is Peter, whose successor is the Pope, to whom we believe it was said in the person of Peter: "*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven*" (Matt. 16:18-19); "*I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren*" (Luke 22:32); "*Feed my lambs. . . . Feed my sheep*" (John 21:15-17). But we believe that these things were said not only to Peter, but also to all the legitimate successors of Peter, and consequently to the Roman Pontiffs, because

(a) So long as Christ's church endures—and it is to endure "*even to the consummation of the world*" (Matt. 28:20)—the form of church government instituted by Christ ought to last; and, since the Lord abides with His own as He promised, "*Behold I am with you*" (Matt., *ibidem*), it does last and will last.

(b) Because the venerable men of old, even in those earliest times of the church, in which you admit that the Roman Church was the true spouse of Christ, those men of old, I say, regarded the Roman Bishops as the successors of Peter in the Roman See, and the heirs of his prerogatives, whereof mention is made in the above-cited texts.

2. As regards the real or possible abuse of Papal authority,

I, a Roman Catholic, and, as your people call me, a Papist, nay, what is worse with you, a Jesuit, truthfully and boldly answer: This is no part of the Catholic and Roman faith to assign to the Pope an arbitrary power (which you would justly term intolerable tyranny in the church of God), so that, relying on that power, he could either impose heavy and insupportable burdens which the Lord and His apostles did not impose, or grant dispensation from divine laws, v. g., from the honor due to secular princes. Admit that the Pope could sin, and sometimes has sinned by claiming for himself rights which he has not received from Christ, and which are not acknowledged by the universal church of those in communion with the apostolic see in matters pertaining to faith and to the spiritual government of the faithful. From this point of view a Catholic will be any one who recognizes in the Pope the primacy of honor and jurisdiction over the several bishops and who will confess with the Council of Florence, at which the Greek church was also represented, that "the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, and true vicar of Christ, and the head of the entire church, and is the father and teacher of all Christians, and that unto him, in the Blessed Peter, has been given by Our Lord Jesus Christ full power of feeding, ruling and governing the universal church." This was the Catholic faith of Latins and Greeks together convened in this ecumenical synod in the year 1439, and hence this was the faith of your fathers before the fatal rise of Luther and Calvin, before the lamentable schism of Henry VIII, who, as you know, because of a shameful love, from being a most ardent defender of the Roman faith against Luther, did not blush to become a violent enemy of the same (faith) and a rebellious apostate.

These things being established, I note, my dear Sir, that you have replied, subtly indeed, but not sufficiently, to what I have laid before you touching the perpetuity and infallibility of the church by saying that "the true church of Christ always exists indeed, and will exist even to the end of time, but is not always found in the same parts of the earth". Accordingly, I briefly repeat that the true church of Christ, whereof

the Roman Pontiff is the secondary foundation and the visible head, may be called a very large tree, whose root is at Rome, which has extended and is extending its branches in every direction, so that while on one side some branches decay, drop off and perish, on another side new ones sprout forth and grow, but whose root stands immovable and unshaken by whatsoever rage of the winds. "*The gates of hell shall not prevail.*" Or, if you prefer, I give this answer: the church is a body, whose head is at Rome, which can extend its limbs hither and thither, can contract them on this or that side, preserving the essence of the body, but whose limbs cannot remain alive if separated from the head — a thing which has happened to those particular churches you mentioned, which ceased to belong to the church of Christ by the very fact that they were torn away by schism or heresy from the Roman church whose members they were. This same thing has happened, alas! to your English church, once so Catholic and, what comes to the same thing, so devoted to the Roman see. Nor can you anywhere find any church, once Catholic, now heretical, which has not been severed by heresy or schism from the Roman church, to which it adhered while orthodox.

It should remain for me, reverend Sir, to answer that part of your letter which reads thus: "I see many things in the Roman church very offensive to me: indulgences, holy water, prayers directed to the spirits of dead saints, prayers for the dead, with many other things not found in the sacred scriptures". But I am exceedingly weary; perhaps you, too, are weary — I of writing, you of reading. Then, too, all these things, when interpreted after the manner of Catholics, not of their detractors, will cease to be a hindrance to you. Finally, if we believe the words of Christ, we shall believe that His church, which He promised to be with, even to the end of the world, cannot teach, introduce, or, by approval, tolerate anything false in doctrine, superstitious in rites, or evil in morals; else would the gates of hell prevail against it, which contravenes the promise. And let this general answer suffice. For the rest, all those topics, and not a few others which you have either omitted or merely hinted at, you will find treated and

explained one by one, and fully enough, though briefly, in the little book. So I will desist from writing, calling on you to witness that I have undertaken this brief disquisition, whatever its worth, not for the sake of idle or contentious disputing, but with one desire, and that the highest, namely, to explain and affirm the truth and to make a way for it into your mind. Time will reveal the worth of my labor; may it be that which concerns you most highly, and which would bring me the greatest possible pleasure.

Farewell, Sir, most beloved and much revered in Christ. I would have you fully persuaded that there is no one who can more truthfully profess himself your most devoted and most respectful servant than he who, in the truth and charity of Christ, is your humblest and most obedient servant.

JOA. B. ST. PÉ, *of the Society of Jesus.*

Montreal, 8 October, 1749.

If an opportunity presents itself, I beg you to greet Mr. Northon (Norton), Mr. Hawk (Hawks), and the others, their fellow captives, now to my great joy set free; though not, and this I lament, with that freedom wherewith Christ has set us free.

THE LIFE OF BISHOP CONWELL.

BY MARTIN I. J. GRIFFIN.

CHAPTER XIX.

HOGAN "ABANDONS" ST. MARY'S.—O'MEALLY SUCCEEDS HIM.—HIS ANTECEDENTS.—HIS RELATIONS WITH THE BISHOP AND HAROLD.—HIS EXCOMMUNICATION.—APPEAL TO ROME.—CUMMISKEY'S BIBLE.

Father Kenny's Diary sums up the subject of this Chapter :

Nov. 23rd. By newspaper brought by Peter Chevers from Wilmington it appears that Wm. Hogan, of vile memory, sailed from Newcastle on Wednesday 19th for Liverpool. May the ship Alexander have taken off the scapegoat and all the abominations of the schismatical Trustees and their adherents of St. Mary's, Phila.! May the Kid O'Mealy soon follow!

The report was true. Hogan had gone, and apparently without agreement with the Trustees, as they spoke of him as having "abandoned" the congregation. His nearest friends and allies immediately began to decry him and to endorse all that his opponents had said about him. He was "by some of his best friends declared to be the greatest villain that ever came to this country—his conduct proved all this." (Ms, Letter S, A. C. H. Society Col.)

Shortly before Hogan's retirement, his successor, O'Mealy appeared on the scene, and gave a renewal of life

to the schism, reviving the expiring fires of dissension. O'Meally had served as pastor in Falmouth, England for one year, from August 1822, to August 1823. Hogan for the Trustees, invited him to come to Philadelphia, as his assistant, though he (O'Meally) afterwards declared that he was "ignorant of the nature and origin of the schism". He arrived from Ireland on Oct. 14th., by the ship Alexander. He waited on Bishop Conwell, probably on the day after his arrival, and presented his papers. To these, so he afterwards claimed, no objection was made. They were no doubt in proper form, but were not, says Bishop England, "from the last Bishop under whom he had served." (Works V. 197.) So on the same day the Bishop notified O'Meally that he was "sufficiently persuaded that he had come to Philadelphia for the purpose of upholding the schism". He therefore ordered him "to abstain from celebrating the Sacrifice of the Mass, or performing any other priestly functions in the diocese."

On the next day (the 16th) the Trustees met, and the "Committee to procure assistance" reported "the arrival in this country of Rev. Thaddeus J. O'Meally, whose documents had been presented to the Bishop, and declared satisfactory, and they appearing to the Board to be perfectly regular, and his commendatory letters (which were presented) being quite satisfactory" the Board resolved to employ him as a pastor.

On the 18th, O'Meally made reply to the Bishop, that "he had not come for any such purpose", and offered himself as an "instrument of peace."

On the 20th the Trustees presented O'Meally's name to the Bishop as a pastor of St. Mary's, representing him as "a gentleman of unexceptionable character whose moral conduct has been as pure as his talents are respectable."

But the Bishop was absent, probably on the Visitation, and it was Father Harold who made answer. He seems

to have wished to bring the principles at issue into direct question, and so replied that the Bishop "is not aware of any right of presentation as being vested in the Trustees."

O'Meally then suggested that, in view of the disagreement, he should "be acknowledged as pastor until a fair and canonical decision be obtained, with an explicit understanding that neither party give up a particle of the principles for which each is contending."

To this proposition no answer was made. Neither did an inquiry made three days later, as to whether the suggestion was receiving consideration, elicit any response.

O'Meally in spite of the Bishop's prohibition appeared in St. Mary's in the priestly character. On Saturday, Nov. 1st., this advertisement appeared in the *National Gazette*:

ST. MARY'S CHURCH. — A sermon will be preached in St. Mary's Church to-morrow morning by the Rev. Mr. O'Malley, after which a collection will be made towards clothing the indigent children of the congregation.

O'Meally preached, and later defended his disobedience by making the claim that preaching is not an "exclusively priestly function,—that a deacon could preach,—that he had preached as a deacon." But the Bishop was in no humor to be satisfied with a quibble. In fact from this time on principles are given more, and persons less importance in the dispute. He wrote, and Father Cummiskey delivered to O'Meally, a formal demand that he should give "due satisfaction within ten days for his contempt and scandal" and that he should "appear and give pledges for the future. He did not appear, but wrote instead, saying, that he had "no such superstitious horror of an excommunication to be at all affected by it, when he saw it resorted to as a convenient, though rusty, weapon to get rid of an honest and therefore a troublesome adviser."

On the 19th the Bishop sent a summons to O'Meally to meet him on Nov. 20th at St. Joseph's, and show cause why he should not be publicly condemned. The Bishop had learned something. Had he acted as considerately and with as much deliberation in Hogan's case in December 1820, perhaps it might now be possible to write the Life of Bishop Conwell without having to record so many shameful and sorrowful details of the schism.

O'Meally says that he obeyed the summons and "after sitting to be stared at for nearly half an hour, during which not one word of mild expostulation was spoken, nor the slightest symptom of kind and charitable feeling shown" he withdrew. That same day the Bishop wrote out the sentence of excommunication.

At this juncture Hogan departed from Newcastle by the Alexander, the same ship that had brought O'Meally. He had held to the pastorship of St. Mary's Church from May 20th, 1821 to Nov. 20th, 1823, a period of two years and six months, during which he had received for his services sums aggregating \$2733.50. O'Meally had been a pastor, while up to this date Hogan remained the chief pastor. But on this date the Trustees held a meeting and declared that Hogan had "abandoned" the pastorship. So they elected O'Meally to his place, and assigned him the same emoluments, \$1000 salary and \$300 for house rent annually. The next day, Nov. 21st., O'Meally said his first mass in St. Mary's.

On Dec. 7th., the sentence of the Bishop, declaring O'Meally excommunicated, was published in the churches.

HENRY, *by the Grace of God, and the favour of the Apostolic See, Bishop of Philadelphia: to all whom these presents may concern—Greeting:*

Whereas Thad  us J. O'Meally, representing himself as a Priest of the diocese of Limerick, in Ireland; having presumed

to preach publicly in the Church of St. Mary's, in Philadelphia, on Sunday the 2d day of this present month, contrary to the canons of the church; he not having received license from me to that effect; and in defiance of my express prohibition, given verbally in the first instance and subsequently in writing under my hand and the seal of this diocess, dated the 15th of October last, and forbidding him, under pain of *Excommunication to be incurred by the fact*, from exercising, or attempting to exercise, any clerical function within this diocess. And whereas, having been duly and canonically cited and admonished in writing by me, on the 10th instant, to appear before me on this day, the 20th instant, to submit, and give satisfactory pledges for his future forbearance from the exercise of any clerical functions in this diocess, the said Thadeus J. O'Meally did not appear at the time prescribed; but sent a letter, in which he avows his determination to exercise Pastoral functions in the said church; and having been further required in the citation above mentioned, to show cause why the sentence of Excommunication, which he had wantonly incurred by the act of preaching in the Church of St. Mary's, as above recited, should not be declared; or suffer sentence by default, he has failed to show cause; and whereas he has attended at the hour notified to him, to be present and to hear his sentence: Now we, taking all these premises into consideration, and deciding and judging, as I do hereby, that the said Thadeus J. O'Meally has incurred the Excommunication with which he has been threatened, as already recited: I do hereby denounce him as duly and canonically excommunicated, and to be avoided as such by the Faithful; and I command the several Pastors of this diocess that they publish this sentence from their respective altars, those of Philadelphia on Sunday, the 30th instant, and the Pastors in other parts of the diocess on the Sunday next following the receipt of this instrument, or a copy of the same signed by me.

In testimony whereof I sign my name, and have caused the seal of this diocess to be affixed hereunto. Done at Philadelphia on Thursday, the 20th day of November, 1823.

HENRY, *Bishop of Philadelphia.*

The above not having been published on the 30th, at the request of R. W. Meade, who induced the Bishop to expect the submission of Mr. O'Meally, was deferred to Sunday the 7th of December, when it was published in the Chapel of St. Joseph's from the pulpit, immediately after the sermon, in the presence and by command of the Bishop; and it was published on the same day and hour at the churches of the Most Holy Trinity and St. Augustine.

Against this sentence O'Meally appealed to Rome. So also did the Trustees, declaring that their "grand and ultimate object was to secure an obedience to Episcopal authority and the Holy See upon the only basis upon which the obedience of Americans can be secured, namely the frank and explicit acknowledgement of the people's rights and the accurate demarcation of the Episcopal Authority." This appeal was signed by John Ashley, John Leamy, R. W. Meade, Edw. Barry, Bernard Gallagher, John Keeffe, Patrick Connell and Archibald Randall.

The Bishop was certainly surrounded with troubles. His most intimate friends paid no great regard to his wishes. He had withheld his approbation from the work of Father Cummiskey in getting out an edition of the Bible, and had asked other Bishops to do the same. (See Chap. 12, p. 9). Nevertheless the Bible appeared in print. The *National Gazette* of Dec. 22nd, 1823 contained an advertisement of Doway Bibles by Eugene Cummiskey.

Is now publishing, under the patronage of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Connolly, Bishop of New York, the special approbation of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Cheverus, Bishop of Boston, granted June 14th, 1823, and the immediate inspection of a Catholic Clergyman, Two stereotyped editions of a Doway Bible, carefully copied from the Ven. Rt. Rev. Richard Challoner's edition. Octavo edition, bound \$5, or complete in 20 numbers, 25 cents each. Quarto edition, with engravings, \$10 bound, or complete in 40 numbers, 25 cents each.

At this time the assistants of the Bishop at St. Joseph's were Revs. Wm. V. Harold, John Ryan, J. Fitzpatrick, and James Cummiskey.

Bishop Conwell who had done all that he could to prevent the publication of the work finally endorsed it and gave it his approbation Dec. 3rd, 1824. It was printed on paper made at Willcox's Mills at Concord, Penna. (Records A. C. H. S. VIII, p. 73.)

APPROBATION

Having examined and finding that the Philadelphia octavo and quarto editions of the Doway Bible, printed and published by Mr. Eugene Cummiskey, have been carefully copied from the fifth quarto Dublin edition of the same, published under the sanction of the late Rev. Dr. Troy, and his successor Dr. Murray, Archbishops of Dublin, and recommended by all the Prelates of Ireland to their flocks; I do hereby give my full approbation to the circulation of it, as being the most accurate and genuine translation of the Holy Scriptures from the languages in which they have been originally written; and therefore I do hereby recommend it accordingly. In testimony of which I do hereby subscribe my name and affix the Diocesan seal this 13th day of December, 1824.

HENRY CONWELL,
Bishop of Philadelphia.

N. B. Mr. Cummiskey has my approbation for publishing Haydock's grand folio Bible.

This grand folio has not up to this time been equalled by any Catholic publisher.

CHAPTER XX.

BISHOP ENGLAND'S "INTERMEDDLING".—AGAIN THE AMENDMENT OF THE CHARTER.—BAPTISM OF A PRINCE.—SENTIMENTS OF THE BISHOP.—DOINGS OF THE TRUSTEES.—REV. PHILIP LARISCY, HIS SUSPENSION, DEATH AND BURIAL.—ANOTHER ELECTION OF TRUSTEES.—SETTLEMENT OF THE VESTMENT SUIT.—DEATH OF KEATING.—A NEW CHURCH PROJECTED.—NEW CEMETERY PURCHASED.—BISHOP ENGLAND STILL "ENCOURAGING O'MEALLY."

Though excommunicated, O'Meally did not hesitate to take upon himself to discharge the office of a Catholic pastor. On New Year's Day 1824 he married James Palmer, and Anna Amelia, daughter of the late Thomas Ash, as the *Aurora* announced.

Bishop England, who seems to have had some former acquaintance with O'Meally, resumed, or rather continued, his efforts to restore peace to St. Mary's and the church of Philadelphia. He succeeded, as peacemakers often do, only in getting himself roundly denounced by both parties. Bishop Conwell's suspicions were aroused when he saw Bishop England seeking the confidence of the Hoganites, and looked upon him as a supporter of their faction. His letter to the Archbishop of January 4th, 1824, shows that he so thought of him and his "intermeddling."

With respect to the schism, I think nothing can support it any longer if Dr. England would have the goodness to desist from interfering. The Trustees have issued a new pamphlet. My opinion is that Dr. England furnished the materials and Lawyer Ingersoll and Matthew Carey have put it in print as coming from O'Meally.

The main way to extinguish the schism is to obtain from the Holy See an inhibition to debar Dr. England from inter-

meddling in any concerns save his own and those of his Diocese, and even then . . . on the Civil Constitution until there shall be a perfect settlement in Philadelphia, and until Propaganda gives sanction to it, which I hope they never will. I really believe Dr. England's main object is to get himself removed from the torrid plains of Carolina and Georgia into a more salubrious climate, e. g. into Maryland or Pennsylvania, or perhaps both. He can take away O'Malley. This is my private opinion, which may be wrong. (Baltimore Archives, Case 15, Letter C.)

On May 28th, he wrote that he:

sends extracts from letter of Bishop England saying that he had written to O'Meally, "which may afford basis for settling the schism in the very manner it must finally, if ever, be terminated, on principles proposed three years ago—a recognition of your right, but sacrifices on both sides. It will not answer to look for a triumphant victory; in doing so you sacrifice a permanent to an empty exhibit." I cannot have a good opinion of Bishop England's motives after past experience—same evils he created by former mode.

And on June 6th,

The Bishop of Charleston is still corresponding with O'Meally, and encouraging his cause—he (England) is preparing to go to Rome; I have broken off all communication with him since I discovered him to be implicated in this business. I hope his Democratic Church regime will not find favor or be sanctioned at Rome, with his Convention and Civil Constitution of the Church, which is designed to be ambulatory throughout America. I find myself under the necessity of sending a *caveat* to Rome to frustrate all such ill designs as I consider Dr. England to be meditating. This last statement is a private communication.

The Trustees made this year another attempt to effect the alteration of the charter. At a meeting of the Trustees

on January 7th, J. T. Sullivan and R. W. Meade were appointed "to go forthwith to Harrisburg to endeavor to have the desired amendments passed by the Legislature. But the members of that body having burned themselves in 1823, showed no inclination to do so again in 1824, by trying to pull any more Hoganite chestnuts out of the fire. On February 6th Mr. Conyngham, from the Committee having the proposed amendment under consideration, reported it "inexpedient to grant the request" of the petitioners. The Committee were discharged. The Trustees just after their entry into office had lost the active and efficient services of Augustine Fagan who on January 11th "died suddenly just after finishing his pamphlet to mislead the Legislature, and when he had been preparing to start for Harrisburg the next morning. His untimely end has been ascribed to poison. The Coroner's inquest gave no further opinion than that he died suddenly. He was buried that same evening. (Concatenation, p. 82.) So this attempt had an early ending.

The Bishop's letters to the Archbishop give some information as to the state of the diocese at this time, and of an event which he thought of importance, the baptism in Philadelphia of a scion of the Bonapartes. He writes under date of January 12th. The contents of the letter however show that this was an error and that he wrote on February 13th. He informed the Metropolitan that:

Many places in Pennsylvania want priests,—I prefer to leave them without any, to sending bad ones,—He asks that Mr. Smith at Seminary at Emmittsburg be ordained, if Bishop Dubois will permit, and send him,—destined for this diocese,—no remedy but to build a church,—to close with these fallen people would be to destroy Religion, the best are worse than Voltaire,—silence best answer for Hoganites,—Bishop England has 80 subscribers here,—has ordained Sullivan, (Nov. 25th, 1823, Rev. Patrick O'Sullivan, at Charleston. Diurnal,

p. 67)—Abbe Athelize returned from Kentucky,—came as far as Lancaster,—I have disciplined him for coming here,—He is an active, zealous man, but I fear the priests here would not show him their countenances, — The Princess, daughter of Joseph Bonaparte, was safely delivered of a fine boy about midnight last night.—I have spent the forenoon of this day with the family and Baptized the child,—Joseph, the grandfather, is godfather,—the godmother is Laetitia, Madame mère (Mater Imperator) represented par Charlotte, tante de L'enfant, who is going to Brussels next month to bring her mother to this country. I have got an episcopal ring by the circumstances, with a large precious stone, but still more precious being the ring of the celebrated Cardinal Ximines and three other personages since his day.

In his Concatenation of Documents, Bishop Conwell published the following account of this event: (p. 103.)

In concluding these memorable references relating to the Catholic Church in Philadelphia, the following intelligence, which will be received with great pleasure and gratification, is communicated especially to those who are interested in the cause which the foregoing documents refer to.

On Thursday, the 12th of February of this present year, 1824, *The Princess Zenaide Charlotte Julia Bonaparte, daughter* to the Prince Joseph, (Count de Survilliers,) formerly King of Spain and the Indies, and *wife* to the Prince Charles Julius Laurence Lucien Bonaparte, was safely delivered of a male infant, (at the hour of midnight,) which was baptized on the following day, being the 13th, at 1 o'clock, by the Right Rev. Dr. Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia. — The name given to the child is Joseph Lucien Charles Napoleon Bonaparte. The godfather was the said Prince Joseph, the child's grandfather, and the godmother was Letitia, the Emperor Napoleon's mother, and the child's great grandmother, who lives at *Rome*, and was represented on this occasion, as proxy, by her grand-daughter, the Princess Charlotte Bonaparte, the child's aunt.

In the course of that same day, the Bishop was presented by the *Count de Survilliers*, with an *Episcopal Diamond Ring* of great intrinsic value, but as being originally *that of Cardinal Ximenes*, one of the most celebrated characters of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century, and afterwards the property, in succession, of some of the greatest men whom Spain and the Indies have produced since that period, its value is thereby enhanced beyond estimation, and shall, from this consideration, be for ever held and esteemed by the Bishop as a precious *relic*, and a grateful memorial of the *renowned personage* who *presented* it.

The father of the child, Charles Bonaparte, was the eldest son of Lucien Bonaparte, brother of the first Napoleon and "the only member of the family who refused to accept kingship." He was born in 1803, and married his cousin Zenaide in 1822. When only 19 years old, he devoted himself with patient energy to scientific studies, for which his European education had given him a decided predilection. Observing that a great many birds of the new world were not described by Alexander Wilson, the naturalist, Charles Bonaparte undertook to supply a supplement to Wilson's work, the first part of which was published in Philadelphia, in 1825, and was immediately recognized as possessing high merit. During the six years of his residence in Philadelphia, he continued his researches, and gave their results to the world.

In 1828 he rejoined his father in Italy, and began, in 1833, the publication of a magnificent work, the "Iconography of the Italian Fauna." In 1843, the late King of Prussia sanctioned his election as honorary member of the Academy of Science of Berlin, and in the next year he was elected corresponding member of the Institute of France. He founded the Scientific Congress of Italy, and presided at most of the annual meetings in the principal cities of that country. One of his numerous productions is the

"Comparative List of the Ornithology of Rome and Philadelphia." Altogether he has produced over forty works upon natural history, besides contributing largely to the transactions of learned societies all over the world. (The *Hesperian*, St. Louis.)

The author has endeavored to trace the ring of Cardinal Ximenes, but without success. It was not found with the remains of Bishop Conwell, when they were transferred from the "Bishop's Burial Ground", to the "vaults under the Cathedral sanctuary", on March 16th, 1869.

The correspondence with the Archbishop gives further facts: March 6th, 1824. He wrote:

that he has been obliged to remove Father Larissey from St. Augustine's church,—The Miscellany (Bishop England's paper) is not giving satisfaction,—the recital of Prince Hohenlohe's miracles are not calculated to make proselytes in this country.

(The *Philadelphia Gazette*, March 16th contains a report of the miraculous cure of Mrs. Mattingly. M. I. J. G.)

March 16th.—He had received a letter from Bishop England, who considers O'Meally a more dangerous man than Hogan, and more calculated to make trouble.

March 17th.—Another letter from Bishop England, who advises that first step is to send away the excommunicated priest, and shut up the church.—Subscriptions to the new church progressing very favorably.—Trustees see in this their downfall,—Meade is the person prompting O'Meally,—there is great bustling among them,—Inglesi is still in Philadelphia.

March 20th. Letter of Propaganda approving our conduct with Inglesi, who is to return to Europe to do penance.—Propaganda writes Bishop Dubourg not to allow Inglesi to say mass if he went to Louisiana,—I am anxious to know what these unfortunate schismatics suggest in their last communication,—they flatter me by ascribing all the discontent to other clergymen.

In March 1824 notice was given of the projected enlargement of St. Joseph's and subscriptions solicited. The notice declared "the chapel of St. Joseph's utterly disproportionate to the extreme number of the congregation and in all respects unsuited for the purpose of divine worship."

The "Picture of Philadelphia in 1824," issued by James Wilson, says:

St. Joseph's Church in Willing's Alley has been enlarged twenty-seven feet, and since the unhappy differences existing between Rev. Bishop Conwell and a majority of the congregation of St. Mary's Church, divine service is performed every Sabbath as in other Catholic Churches.

The Bishop makes frequent references in his letters to this matter of the enlargement of St. Joseph's.

The Rev. Philip Lariscy, spoken of above, died on April 6th, 1824, and was buried on Thursday the 8th, at three o'clock, P. M. He was a native of County Tipperary, Ireland, educated at St. John's College, Waterford, and probably ordained there. Previously to his coming to America, he had been stationed at Cork. With Rev. Timothy Brown, he came to Newfoundland, and served on the mission at St. John's. In 1818 he came to Boston and built St. Augustine's chapel, South Boston. He remained there three years and then went on missions in New Jersey and New York, as he had been on similar duty in Massachusetts. His name appears for the first time on the Registers of St. Augustine's, Phila., on July 22nd, 1822, and as it does not appear very frequently thereafter, it is probable that he attended at Staten Island, at Newburgh, N. Y., and elsewhere throughout New Jersey and New York, in which office he may be regarded as the successor of Rev. Ferdinand Farmer, of Revolutionary days. This theory is supported by statements made in the *Laity's Direc-*

tory for 1822, in Mulrenan's, *Sketch of the Church on Long Island*, and in Shriner's, *History of the Church in Patterson, N. J.* His last record at St. Augustine's was on Feb. 15th, 1824. The following narrative of his troubles in Philadelphia, is taken from a manuscript endorsed "Memorandum concerning Rev. Mr. Lariscy, who died on the 6th April, 1824", which is believed to have been written by Mr. Joseph Snyder, a staunch adherent of Bishop Conwell.

April 8th, 1824. — This day the Rev. Philip Lariscy was buried at St. Augustine's Church, who died on Tuesday last. When this gentleman first came to St. Augustine's Church about 7 or 8 months ago, he preached several Sermons in Irish; his sentiments in these sermons as well as his conduct in every other respect were violent against Hogan and his party, so much so that they were very much exasperated and did abuse him in public and in private, and also found much fault with the Bishop for suffering him to remain here; after some time several of the Hogan party made themselves acquainted with him and no doubt saw his weak side, made him presents and invited him to their houses, treating him to eating and drinking; at the same time the poor man did not perceive their deception; on the contrary, made himself believe that he had persuaded them to leave Hogan and return again to their duty as Roman Catholics; this he frequently asserted, and claimed great praise for the good work he had done. Things went on in this way for several months, and these very people, whom Mr. Lariscy had flattered himself to have brought back again to the church, yet there was evidently no change in them, but rather more violent against the Bishop, and of this there was complaint made to the Bishop, and also other complaints from the congregation of St. Augustine's repeatedly, that the Bishop concluded to send him to another part of the diocese; this he refused to comply with, and absolutely declared in the church in presence of the congregation that he would not go, that he was the senior pastor of St. Augustine's, and that no one should remove him from there;

the Bishop then withdrew his faculties, except saying mass—contrary to this mandate the said Mr. Lariscy ascended the pulpit and preached a violent sermon on the occasion, a great number of the Hoganites attended, no doubt by agreement, as some of them declared, to see some fun; however, the poor man, it seems, took it by fits and starts, at times he would exclaim vehemently against the Bishop and the other clergy and at other times appeared penitent and would promise to make every concession, but as soon as he again got into company with those persons on the opposite side, he would become as refractory as ever—things went on in this way for several weeks, in which time he became much more attached to those persons, he dined and supped with them more frequent, finally took ill on the first day of April Inst. and died on the 6th. As soon as he was dead a report was circulated that some unfair means had been practised on him in order to hasten his death, in consequence of which his body was opened by Drs. ———, who pronounced that a dropsy in the brain was the cause of his death and that the decease was brought on by intemperance. On the 8th Inst. preparations were made for his interment; as he had appointed Hoganites for his executors, they wished to have a procession; to this the Rev. Mr. Hurley objected and the corpse was immediately taken out of the church into the graveyard, contrary to the expectations of a great concourse of spectators (Hoganites); as soon as the corpse and clergy were out of the church the doors were closed; these persons seeing themselves disappointed for which they had assembled (a procession), their disorderly behavior was noticed, particularly that of the females, and very unbecoming any decent person, any one in a church.

(To be continued)

FATHER PETER HELBRON'S GREENSBURG, PA. REGISTER

Continued

Copied from the original book by the Rev. Father John, O. S. B., of Saint Vincent's Abbey, Pennsylvania. Translated by Lawrence F. Flick, M. D., LL. D.

REGISTER OF BIRTHS FOR 1804.

Original book, page 31.

NOTE: Underneath the entry of the year the names of the months of January, March and April are placed. Below these, before the entries, numerals are placed, without, however, indicating which of the three months is meant.

Daugherty, Sara, of Lagely and Sara Daugherty, born March 17, baptized on the 1st. Sponsors, Dionysius Conner and Margaret his sister.

Curring [Curry?], Mary, of John and Margaret Curring, date of birth March 2nd, baptized April 1st. Sponsors, Neil Mcglary and Bridget Shorthy.

Noell, Mary, of John and Petronilla Noell, born in January, baptized the 1st. Sponsors, Frederick Septer and Margaret Griffy.

Müller, John, of Martin and Magdalen Müller, born March 14, baptized the 8th (month not stated). Sponsors, John and Barbara Henrich [Henry?].

Daugerthy, John, of William and Margaret Daugerthy, born March 5th, baptized the 15th (month not stated). Sponsors, George and Sybilla Ruffner.

Brick, Mary, of Henry and Elizabeth Brick, born March 25, baptized 22nd (month not stated). Sponsors, Joseph and Mary Ann Grünewald.

Original book, page 32.

Mcquys, [McHugh?] Catharine, of John and Mary Mcquys, born January 9, 1803, baptized May 6th. Sponsors, Martin and Elizabeth O'Bryen [Obrien?].

Wheat, [White?] David, of Anthony and Mary Wheat, three years old, baptized May 12th. Sponsors, Michael and Elizabeth Calagher [Gallagher?].

Clerick, Daniel, of ——— and Helena Clerick, born July 9th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 12th. Sponsors, Henry Manteck [Montague?] and Mary Mcqueyer [McGuire?].

Dagourthy, [Dougherty?] Margaret, of James and Elizabeth Dagour-

- thy, born March 1st, baptized May 12th. Sponsors, Manasses and Catharine Dagourthy.
- Dagourthy, Daniel, of Manasses and Catharine Dagourthy, born May 4th, baptized May 12th. Sponsors, Jacob Broun [Brown?] and Henna (probably Hanna) Calagher [Gallagher?].
- Tygard [Taggart?] John, of Abraham and Anna Tygard, born November 31st (probably of the preceding year), baptized May 12th. Sponsors, Henry McEkan [McCann?] and Rose Algoyer [Allgeier?].
- Broun, [Brown?] Francisca, of Jacob and Francisca Broun, born January 5th, baptized May 16th. Sponsors, James Calleggar [Gallagher?] and Bridget Dagouthy [Dougherty?].
- Mequeyer [McGuire?] Anna, of Patrick and Anna Mcqueyer, born June 20th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 20th. Sponsors, John and Margaret Dogourthy.
- Archsman [Assmann? or Ashman?] William, of William and Mary Archsman, born August 9th, baptized May 20th. Sponsors, Patrick and Bridget McDemord [McDermott?].
- Meglochly, [McLaughlin?] Genevieve, of Thomas and Genevieve Meglochly, born September 20th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 20th. Sponsors, Daniel and Margaret Thimory.
- Thymori, Mary, of Dionysius and Mary Thymori, born December 11th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 20th. Sponsors, Patrick Michen [Meehan?] and Anna Kely [Kelly?].
- Clerick, Elizabeth, of Jacob and Catharine Clerick, born December 11th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 20th. Sponsors, John and Mary Kuhn.
- Crecck [Craig?], Prudentia, of Joseph and Ann Creeck, born January 2d, baptized May 20th. Sponsors, Juy (Hugh?) and Prudentia Boyl.
- Creck [Craig?], Nicholas, of Joseph and Anna Creck, born July 22, 1801, baptized May 26th. Sponsors, Elisaius and Mary Therby [Durby?].
- Meccferry, Edward, of Neal and Anna Meccferry, born March 15, 1801, baptized May 26th. Sponsors, Joseph and Catharine Meccferry.
- Rogers, Amelia, of Frank and Elizabeth Rogers, born April 1st, baptized May 26th. Sponsors, Jacob Broun [Brown?] and Mary Aelentayer.

Original book, page 33.

- Zinsdorf, Henry, of George and Anna Mary Zinsdorf, born April 12th, baptized May 31st. Sponsors, Dionysius and Catharine Handel.
- Blayton, Frances, a woman received into the Church. Baptized May 27th.
- Noell, Isaias, of Peter and Margaret Noell, November 10th (without stating what happened on that day), previously of no religion, baptized June 3rd. Sponsors, John and Martha Magoy [McCoy?].

Ellesen [Ellison ?] Elizabeth, of John and Mary Ellesen, born September 6th, 1803, baptized June 10th. Sponsors, Timothy Conner and Catharine Broun.

Mechyn [Maginn, McKean ?] Joseph, of Berny and Salome Mechyn, born October 22nd, 1803, baptized June 10th, Sponsors, Dionysius Brogen and Mary Broun.

Kelly, James, of John and Martha Kelly, two years old, baptized June 24th. Sponsors, Peter and Catharine Roger.

Noell, Mary, of Joseph and Margaret Noell, born March 5th, baptized July 1st. Sponsors, Simon Ruffner and Margaret Griffy.

Roger, Hugo, of Anthony and Rose Roger, born June 3rd, baptized July 1st. Sponsors, John Macher [Maher ?] and Bridget Schorthy.

Original book, page 34.

Septer, Elizabeth, of Frederick and Anna Maria Septer, born April 23rd, baptized July 8th. Sponsors, Joseph, and Margaret Noell.

— Peter Joseph, born June 27th, baptized July 9th. Sponsors, Peter Clearfield and Mary Carriens [Cairns or Kerens ?].

O'Dannel [O'Donnell ?] Catharine, of Daniel and Cecilia O'Dannel, born October 2nd, baptized October 28th. Sponsors, Carol and Bridget Roger.

Kaess, Peter, of Jos  ph and Mary Kaess, born October 9th, baptized November 1st. Sponsors, Henry and Elizabeth Brick.

Original book, page 35.

Bayl [Boyle ?] John, of Felix and Elizabeth Bayl (date of birth not given), baptized November 18th. Sponsors, Dionysius Delery and his wife.

Victor, David, of John and Mary Victor, born October 1st, baptized November 19th. Sponsors, David Victor and Elizabeth, a widow.

Mecferry, Daniel, of Timothy and Susan Mecferry, born August 9, baptized November 24th. Sponsors, Michael Mequy [McHugh ?] and Mary Dugen [Dugan ?].

Carr, Theresa, of Patrick and Petronilla Carr, born October 15, baptized November 24th. Sponsors, Charles and Genevieve Mecferien.

Carr, James, of Manasses and Catharine Carr, born July 18th, baptized November 24th. Sponsors, James Carr and Bridget Boyl.

Dugen [Dugan ?] Salome, of Daniel and Catharine Dugen, born October 25th, baptized November 24th. Sponsors, Neal Meccbraid [McBride ?] and Helen Carr.

Lemain [Lehman or Leamen ?] Stephen, of Lawrence and Elizabeth Lemain, born May 10th, baptized November 24th. Sponsors, James and Mary Carr.

1805

Brick, Mary, of Peter and Margaret Brick, born December 9th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized February 24th. Sponsors, Matthias and Mary Brick.

Daguorthy [Dougherty?] (name of child not given), of Charles and Anna Dagworthy, born November 13 (evidently of preceding year), baptized March 24. Sponsors, James Meguy [McHugh?] and Susan, his mother.

Isly [Easly?], Sara, of Andrew and Elizabeth Isly, born May 20th, baptized April 14th. Sponsors, Henry and Margaret Kuhn.

Original book, page 36.

Merckell [Markle?], Jacob, of John and Barbara Merckell, born March 3, baptized April 14. Sponsors, Martin and Magdalen Müller.

Septer, John, of Adam and Mary Septer, born July 28th, baptized April 14th. Sponsors, Patrick and Margaret Gryffen [Griffin?].

Dougerthy [Dougherty?], Mary, of Patrick and Sara Dougerthy, born October 10th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized April 14th. Sponsors, John and Helen Dougerthy.

Meglafferty, James, of John and Mary Meglafferty, born December 10th, baptized May 23rd. Sponsors, Patrick Ferry and Bridget Roger.

McDavid [McDevitt?], Elizabeth, of Henry and Elizabeth McDavid, born August 8th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized June 2nd. Sponsors, William and Catharine O'Hara.

Branner, Mary, of James and Salome Branner, born September 12 (evidently of the preceding year), baptized June 2nd. Sponsors, Patrick and Catharine Levy.

Scholl, Henry, of John and Mary Scholl, born March 18th, baptized June 2nd. Sponsors, James Mecfoll [McFaul?] and Susan Queen [Quinn?].

Müller, John, of Jacob and Sara Müller, born March 20th, baptized June 2nd. Sponsors, Neal Meclarsy and Johana Lauchely.

Doffy [Duffy], Frank, of Patrick and Martha Doffy, born December 2nd (evidently of the preceding year), baptized June 2nd. Sponsors, Peter Declary and Bridget Mecbraid [McBride?].

Denny, Salome, of Dionysius and Julia Denny, born March 1st, baptized June 2nd. Sponsors, Anthony and Catharine Keller.

Brannen, Susan, of John and Anna Brannen, born February 2, baptized June 2. Sponsors, Edward and Eva Meccferren.

Reyly [Reilly?], Elizabeth, of Martin and Anna Reyly, born February 11th, baptized June 2nd. Sponsors, Darby and Mary his wife.

Dagourthy, Anna, of Charles and Anna Dagourthy, born March 3rd, baptized June 2nd. Sponsors, Dionysius Morfy [Murphy?] and Mary Kelly.

Mechaflly, Anna, of ——— and Eleanor Mechaflly, born February 1st, baptized June 2. (No sponsors are given.)

Original book, page 37.

Branner, Mary, of Michael and Mary Branner, born April 15, baptized June 2d. Sponsors, Christopher and Catharine Branner.

- Good, Nicholas, of Balthasar and Rose Good, five years old, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, Stephen and Catharine Branner.
- (evidently Good), Susan, of Balthasar and Rose, three years old, on the 12th of May. Baptized June 5th. Sponsor, Rose Meccfolh [McFaul?].
- Good, Rose, of Balthasar and Rose Good, born December 23d, 1804, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, Julius Meccanigen and wife.
- Massercop, Margaret, of — and Anna Massercop, born in 1803, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, Jacob May and Anna Meckennegy.
- Greven, John George, of John and Margaret Greven, two years old, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, Joseph and Eleanor Kitsly.
- Gyllen, [Gillen?], James Henry, of Philip and Rose Gyllen, born May 5th, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, George Mekanigen and Mary Gyllen.
- Schmolder, Mary Anne, of Edward and Catharine Schmolder, born May 4th, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, James and Genevieve Meccfolh [McFaul?].
- Gibsen [Gibson?] Margaret, of William and Margaret Gibsen, born February 3, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, Julius and Petronilla Meccanigen.
- Massercop, Anna, of — and Anna Massercop, five years old, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, Mary Morfy [Murphy?] and Patrick Brannen.
- Greven, Christina, of George and Margaret Greven, (date of birth not given), baptized June 5th. Sponsors, David and Anna Michen [Meehan?].
- Clerick, Rose, of John and Helen Clerick, born April 17th, baptized June 9th. Sponsors, Felix Daniel and Rose Mequaeyer [McGuire?].

Original book, page 38.

- Daniel, Mary, of Felix and Charity Daniel, born April 12th, baptized June 9th. Sponsors, John and Eleanor McQuayer [McGuire].
- Bready, [Brady?] Thomas, of Lawrence and Catharine Bready, eight years old, baptized June 9th. Sponsors, John Cannedy and Anna Doffyn.
- Bready, [Brady?], Bernard, of Lawrence and Catherine Bready, five years old, baptized June 9th. Sponsors, John Spedy and Elizabeth Stoner.
- Dagourthy [Dougherty?], Mary, of Roger and Eleanor Dagourthy, born July 2d, baptized June 9th. Sponsors, Jacob Braun and Elizabeth Dagourthy.
- Weith [White], Anna, of Anthony and Mary Weith, born February 10th, baptized June 10th. Sponsors, Michael Galagar [Gallagher?] and Elizabeth Weith.
- Laden, Genevieve, of James and Anna Laden, born May 16th, baptized June 15th. Sponsors, Patrick and Bridget Mecchiffisen.

- Mony, Jacob, of William and Mary Mony, born December 24th, baptized June 15th. Sponsors, Jacob Laden and Anna Ferry.
- Callenz, [Collins?], Isaac, of Daniel and Catharine Callenz, four years old, baptized June 15th. Sponsors, William Mony and Catharine Dagourthy.
- Callenz [Collins?], John, of John and Catharine Callenz, three years old, baptized June 15th. Sponsors, Jeremiah and Margaret Liffing.
- Workman, Henrietta, of Jacob and Mary Workman, born February 18th, baptized June 15th. Sponsors, Nicholas and Theme Gelaspy [Gillespie?].
- Wambold, Margaret, of Luke and Margaret Wambold, born February 12th, baptized June 15th. Sponsors, Edward Borns [Burns?] and Anne Trucks.
- Michen [Meehan?], James, of William and Elizabeth Michen, born on the 2d (month not given), baptized June 15th. Sponsors, Daniel and Margaret Commery.

Original book, page 39.

- Cinnen [Keenan?] Margaret and Mary Anne, William and Elizabeth, brothers and sisters, born of Jeremiah and Margaret Cinnen. Sponsors, Thomas Meclachlen [McLaughlin?] and wife.
- Gelaspy [Gillespie?], Elizabeth, of Nicholas Gelaspy Jr. and his wife, born April 7th, baptized June 15th. Sponsors, George Trucks and Mary Worckman.
- Gelaspy [Gillespie?], Julia, of James and Anna Gelaspy, born November 1st (evidently of the preceding year), baptized June 15th. Sponsors, ——— Mecchery [McSherry?] and Ann Gelaspy.
- Levain, Thomas, of Timothy and Mary Levain, seven years old, baptized June 15th. Sponsor, Denis O'Breyen [O'Brien?]
- Mcelrayer [McElroy?] Margaret, of John and Margaret Mcelrayer, born November 11th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized June 16th. Sponsors, William Migen [Meehan?] and Anna Meckiffisin.
- Figter [Fechter or Feichter?] Genevieve, of David and Genevieve Figter, six years old, baptized June 16th. Sponsors, John and Elizabeth Figter.
- Gery [Gary?], Elizabeth, of Felix and Anna Gery, born November 15th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized June 17th. Sponsors, Michael Dorren and Anna Drucks.
- Gery [Gary?], Cassidorus, of Felix and Anna Gery, two years old, baptized June 17th. Sponsors, Nicholas and Theme Gelaspy [Gillespie?].
- Bellsaind, Sara, aged twenty-seven years, and married: previously of no religion, baptized June 22, and at once admitted into the Church.
- Dorbain [Durbin?], William, of Nicholas and Catharine Dorbain, born November 27th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized June 22nd. Sponsors, Lawrence Dorbain and Clara Hardin.

Father Peter Helbron's Greensburg, Pa., Register 167

Carr, Anna, of Charles and Anna Carr, born November 27th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized June 22nd. Sponsors, James and Catharine Meckingly [McKinley ?].

Meccferly, Charles, of Manasses and Catharine Meccferly, born May 15th, baptized June 22nd. Sponsors, Daniel and Genevieve Boyl.

Original book, page 40.

Galeger [Gallagher ?], James, of Anthony and Bridget Galeger, born March 19th, baptized June 22nd. Sponsors, Daniel and Susan Boyl Harden.

Meccbraid [McBride ?], Margaret, of Nicholas Meccbraid and his wife, born April 30th, baptized June 22nd. Sponsors, Patrick Boyl and Margaret Meccguy [McHugh ?].

Meccguy [McHugh ?] Catharine, of Michael and Petronilla Meccguy, born June 19th, baptized June 22nd. Sponsors, Manasses and Catharine Car [Carr ?].

Müller, Joseph, of Martin and Magdalen Müller, born June 22nd, baptized August 11th. Sponsors, John Henrich and Magdalen Kuhn.

Brick, Theresa, of Henry Brick (name of the mother omitted), born July 12th, baptized August 15th. Sponsors, Henry Kuhn and Elizabeth Brick.

Ruffner John Jacob, of Simon and Mary Barbara Ruffner, born July 9th, baptized August 15th. Sponsors, Jacob Kuhn and Catharine Seyverth [Seybert ?], maiden.

Griffy [Greavy ?], Rachel, of Henry and Magdalen Griffy, born June 22nd, baptized August 17th. Sponsors, Patrick and Margaret Griffy.

Kely [Kelly ?], James Henry, of Patrick and Margaret Kely, born January 19th, baptized August 25th. Sponsors, Henry Kuhn and Elizabeth Brick, maiden.

Meclosscy [McCloskey ?], Daniel, of John and Rose Meclosscy, born March 8th, baptized September 8th. Sponsors, Jacob and Catharine Kuyn [Kuhn ?].

Meclosscy [McCloskey?], Petronilla, of John and Rose Meclosscy, born January 15, baptized September 8th. Sponsors, Joseph and Catharine Schmidt.

Meclosscy [McCloskey?] John, of John and Rose Meclosscy, born March 1st, baptized September 8th. Sponsors, Patrick Mecay [McKay?], and Catharine Ruffner.

Note: The years of birth of the children of the preceding entries have been omitted. The children evidently are brothers and sisters, and must have been born in different years.

Roger, Michael, of Michael and Elizabeth Roger, born April 18, baptized September 8th. Sponsors, Patrick Dougerthy [Dougherty?], and Mary Seiffert [Seybert?].

Original book, page 41.

Mecloscy [McCloskey?] James, of John Mecloscy (name of mother omitted), born March 27th, baptized September 8th. Sponsors, Michael and Catharine Hagey.

Meclossey [McCloskey?], Michael, of Nicholas Meclossey (name of mother omitted), born March 11th, baptized September 8th. Sponsors, Mecelvay [McKelvey?] and Margaret.

Coller, Mary, of Michael and Magdalen Coller, born October 5th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized September 15th. Sponsors, Frederick and Mary Septer.

Ruffner, Simon, of George and Elizabeth Ruffner, born on the 7th of this month, baptized September 22nd. Sponsors, Simon and Catharine Ruffner.

September at Bofflo.

Archibleck, Mary, of — Archibleck and Mary, his wife. Date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Daniel and Mary Meguy [McGee?].

Keyl [Kyle?] Elizabeth, of John and Elizabeth Keyl, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, John and Elizabeth Archibleck.

Pock, Susan, of William and Anna Pock, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Bernard and Catharine Hagen.

Hegen [Hagen?] Anna, of Bernard and Catharine Hagen, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, William and Mary Anne Schiltz [Schultz?].

Michen [Meehan?], James, of John and Mary Michen, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Thomas and Elizabeth Dugen [Dugan?].

Hergy [Hershey?], Thomas, of Robert and Elizabeth Hergy, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, John and Mary Michen [Meehan?].

Gelaspy [Gillespie?] Anna, of Hughy and Anna Gelaspy, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Connel and Mary O'Dannel.

Clugency, Margaret, of John and Mary Clugency, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, John Caligher [Gallagher?] and Mary Mecbraid [McBride?].

Dugen [Dugan?] Catharine, of Michael and Bridget Dugen, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Peter Dugen and Elizabeth Heister.

Dugen, James, of Neal and Anna Dugen, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Robert and Elizabeth Hergen.

Original book, page 42.

Dagerthy [Dougherty?] Patrick, of Neal and Crescentia Dagerthy, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, James Ferry and Mary Dagerthy.

- Meckeley, Daniel, of John and Susan Meckeley, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Patrick and Mary O'Dannel.
- Duffy, Margaret, of Charles and Petronilla Duffy, date of birth not given, baptized September 18th (apparently a mistake for the 28th). Sponsors, Michael and Margaret Dugen.
- O'Dannel [O'Donnell?], Bridget, of Connel and Mary O'Dannel, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Dionysius O'Dannel and Sara Hartman.
- Gelaspy [Gillespie?], John, of John and Elizabeth Gelaspy, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, John and Barbara Duffing.
- Dagerthy [Dougherty?], Hughy, of James and Anna Dagerthy, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, John and Elizabeth Gelaspy [Gillespie?].
- Roger, Thomas, of Connel and Anna Roger, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Patrick and Mary Meckellrey [McElroy?]
- Schweny [Sweeney,], Hughy, of Charles and Mary Schweny, date of birth not given, baptized September 30th. Sponsors, John and Anna Duffy.
- Hartman, Margaret, of Philip and Margaret Hartman, date of birth not given, baptized September 30th. Sponsors, William and Mary Duffy.
- Anderson, Joseph, of Joseph and Mary Anderson, date of birth not given, baptized September 30th. Sponsors, James Meclachlen [McLaughlin?], and Catharine Schweny [Sweeney?].
- Schweny [Sweeney?], James, of John and Bridget Schweny, date of birth not given, baptized September 30th. Sponsors, John and Catharine Hagen.
- Hagen, Bridget, of John and Bridget Hagen, date of birth not given, baptized September 30th. Sponsors, John and Bridget Schweny [Sweeney?].
- Hagen, Margaret, of John and Catharine Hagen, date of birth not given, baptized September 30th. Sponsors, John and Bridget Schweny [Sweeney?].
- Hagen, John, of John and Catharine Hagen, date of birth not given, baptized September 30th. Sponsors, John and Bridget Schweny [Sweeney?].
- Schweny [Sweeney?] Solomon, of John and Bridget Schweny, date of birth not given, baptized September 30th. Sponsors, Neal and Mary Mecbraid [McBride].

Original book, page 43.

- Meguy [McHugh?] John, of Patrick and Bridget Meguy, date of birth not given, baptized September 26th. Sponsors, Francis and Elizabeth Meguy.

- Isly [Easly?] William, of Caspar and Elizabeth Isly, date of birth not given, baptized September 26th. Sponsors, William and Mary Schiltz [Schultz?].
- Meguy [McHugh?] Charles, of Daniel and Bridget Meguy, date of birth not given, baptized September 26th. Sponsors, Caspar and Elizabeth Isly [Easly?].
- Meguy [McHugh?], Bernard, of Daniel and Bridget Meguy, date of birth not given, baptized September 26th. Sponsors, Patrick and Bridget Meguy.
- Meguy [McHugh?], Peter, of Charles and Anna Meguy, date of birth not given, baptized September 26th. Sponsors, Patrick and Bridget Meguy.
- Meguichen [McGuigan], Daniel, of John and Cecilia Meguichen, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Michael and Petronilla Meguy [McHugh?].
- Megrafferty [McCafferty?], Genevieve, of Charles and Salome Megrafferty, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Balthasar and Mary Thompson.
- Mecbraid [McBride?], Stephen, of Patrick and Mary Mecbraid, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Anthony and Catharine Kelly.
- Callegar [Gallagher?], James, of ——— and Anna Callegar, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Patrick and Mary Mecbraid [McBride?].
- Callegar, Hughy, of Hughy and Genevieve Callegar, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Peter and Petronilla Callegar.
- Hagerthy [Hagerty?], Robert, of Thomas and Anna Hagerthy, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Edward and Cecilia Schweny [Sweeney?].
- Schweny [Sweeney?], John, of Edward and Sara Schweny, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Richard and Anna Meguy [McHugh?].
- Whey, Anna, of Patrick and Petronilla Whey, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, John and Anna Mecbraid [McBride?].
- Doffy [Duffy?], John, of John and Anna Doffy, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Frank and Anna Duffy.
- Original book, page 44.*
- Forcker [Foraker?], William, of John and Rose Forcker, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, John and Anna Keyl [Kyle?].
- Schweny [Sweeney], Bridget, of Michael and Anna Schweny, date of birth not given, baptized September 28th. Sponsors, Andrew and Susan Dugen [Dugan?].

Daiman [Diamond?], Joseph, a son of John Daiman, Jacob, a brother and William, a relative of the same father, baptized October 7th. Sponsors, Edward and Susan Kohl.

Gery [Gary?], Margaret, of Michael and Mary Gery, date of birth not given, baptized October 7th. Sponsors, Peter and Margaret Dreschler.

Braiden, Charles, of Jacob and Helen Braiden, date of birth not given, baptized October 7th. Sponsor, Peter Thiden.

Moholland [Mulholland?], Daniel, of Daniel and Helen Moholland, date of birth not given, baptized October 7th. No sponsors given.

Higens [Higgins?], James, of Andrew and Margaret Higens, date of birth not given, baptized October 7th. Sponsors, Manasses and Frances Brodlyn.

Green, James, of James and Frances Green, date of birth not given, baptized October 7th. Sponsors, Gabriel and Margaret Mecnackel.

Mecbraid [McBride?], Neal, of Patrick and Mary Mecbraid, date of birth not given, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Anna Door and Mary Cinckley.

Note: The names of two females are here clearly given as sponsors.

Meckeny [McKenna?], Bartholomew, of ——— and Margaret Meckeny, date of birth not given, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Cornelius Mecbraid [McBride?] and Salome Schweny [Sweeney?].

Schweny [Sweeney?], Morgan, of Alexander and Salome Schweny, date of birth not given, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, James and Mary Mecbraid [McBride?].

Mecbraid [McBride?], Patrick, of Patrick and Mary Mecbraid, date of birth not given, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Michael and Margaret Denny.

Mecbraid [McBride?], Cornelius, of Edward and Catharine Mecbraid, date of birth not given, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Patrick and Mary Mecbraid [McBride?].

Meguy [McHugh?], Anna, of ——— and Anna Meguy, date of birth not given, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Bartholomew and Bridget Mecbraid [McBride?].

Carl [Carroll?], Charles, of Hughy and Anna Carl, date of birth not given, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Bartholomew and Bridget Mecbraid [McBride?].

Original book, page 45.

Carole [Carroll?], James, of Hughy and Anna Carole, date of birth not given, baptized October 16th. Sponsors, Bartholomew and Bridget Mecbraid [McBride?].

Grünewald, Mary Elizabeth, of Joseph and Mary Grünewald, date of birth not given, baptized October 2nd. Sponsors, Nicholas and Mary Walhy.

Seyffert [Seybert?], Matthias, of Matthias and Elizabeth Seyffert, date

- of birth not given, baptized October 2nd. Sponsors, Huighy and Genevieve Callegar.
- Cembor [Kemper?], Anthony, of John and Barbara Cembor, date of birth not given, baptized October 2nd. Sponsors, Matthias and Elizabeth Seyffert.
- O'Donnel, Mary, of Connel and Bridget O'Donnel, date of birth not given, baptized October 2nd. Sponsors, John Welsch and Rose Dugen [Dugan?].
- Mecafferty [McCafferty?], Salome, of Neal and Mary Mecafferty, date of birth not given, baptized October 2nd. Sponsors, Connel and Anna Roger.
- Daiman [Diamond?], Daniel, of John and Petronilla Daiman, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Philip and Elizabeth Meguy [McHugh?].
- Daiman [Diamond?], Petronilla, of John and Eleanor Daiman, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Edward Mecfferrien and Petronilla Scharty.
- Schorty, Anna, of Anthony and Bridget Schorty, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, William and Genevieve Glancy.
- Brothly, Anna, of Manasses and Anna Brothly, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Joseph Mollen [Mullen?] and Mary Meckenhady.
- Daiman [Diamond?], Philip, of John and Petronilla Daiman date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Edward and Susan Hohn [Huhn?].
- Roger, Catharine, of John and Cecilia Roger, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Daniel and Mary Reed.
- Lukoy, Elizabeth, of Joseph and Mary Lukoy, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Jacob and Anna Denny.
- Original book, page 46.*
- Schmidt, Susan, of John and Margaret Schmidt, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Christopher and Margaret Gloss [Glass?].
- Kiell, John, of John and Sara Kiell, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, John and Margaret Schmidt.
- Isaac, Elizabeth, of John and Mary Isaac, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Edward and Anna Fiell.
- Meckenalldy [McNulty?], James, of James and Mary Meckenalldy, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Jacob and Anna Reyhen [Ryan?].
- Lin [Lynn?], Margaret, of James and Elizabeth Lin, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Hughy and Catharine Morgen.
- Schwiny [Sweeney?], James, of John and Bridget Schwiny, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, John and Catharine Hagin.

Father Peter Helbron's Greensburg, Pa., Register 173

Hagen, Bridget, of John and Bridget Hagen, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, John and Catharine Hagen.

Hagen, Margaret, of John and Catharine Hagen, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, John and Bridget Schweny [Sweeney?].

Hagen, John, of John and Catharine Hagen, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, John and Bridget Schweny [Sweeney?].

Schweny [Sweeney?], Salome, and Anna, of John and Bridget Schweny, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Neal and Mary Mecbraid [McBride?].

Tenny [Taney?], Nicholas, of Meils and Margaret Tenny, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Patrick and Mary Mecbraid [McBride?].

Tenny [Taney?], Susan, of Meils and Margaret Tenny, date of birth not given, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, Cornelius Mecbraid [McBride?] and Bridget Schweny [Sweeney?].

MecLachelen [McLaughlin?], Thomas, of Henry and Anna Meclachelen, and Anna, a sister, and William and Henry, brothers, children of ——— and Anna Meclachlen, baptized October 6th. Sponsors, John Meclachlen and Henry his brother with their wives.

Original book, page 47.

Morfy [Murphy?], James, of Dionysius and Elizabeth Morfy, date of birth not given, baptized November 3rd. Sponsors, Jacob and Anna May.

Therren, Charles, of Patrick and Margaret Therren, date of birth not given, baptized November 3rd. Sponsors, James and Susan Queen [Quinn?].

Clenegal, Helen, of Huighy and Mary Clenegal, date of birth not given, baptized November 3rd. Sponsors, John Meccfoull [McFaul?] and Anne his sister.

Cannery, Thomas and Margaret, of Thomas and Margaret Cannery, date of birth not given, baptized November 7th. Sponsors, ——— Meckelly and Honora Cannery.

Cannery, Genevieve, of Thomas and Margaret Cannery, date of birth not given, baptized November 7th. Sponsors, John and Martha Kelly.

Kelly, Catharine, of Thomas and Margaret Kelly, date of birth not given, baptized November 7th. Sponsors, Thomas and Margaret Cannery.

Arnst, Elizabeth, of Jacob and Margaret Arnst, date of birth not given, baptized November 23rd. Sponsors Henry Brick and Elizabeth Reinzel.

Ditter, Henry, of Henry and Catharine Ditter, a year old, baptized December 5th. Sponsors, Henry Kuhn and Elizabeth Müller.

HISTORICAL NOTES

In connexion with the scholarly articles on Don Agustin De Iturbide, which appeared in the December and March numbers of the RECORDS, the following notes, collected by the late Mr. Martin I. J. Griffin, are both pertinent and interesting.

President James K. Polk, in his Diary, under date of Thursday, 17th February, 1848, recorded :

About 12 o'clock Madame Iturbide, the widow of the former Emperor of Mexico of that name, called. I saw her in the parlour. She was accompanied by Miss White, the niece of the late Mr. General Van Ness of this city. Madame Iturbide did not speak English, & Miss White interpreted for her. Her business was to see me on the subject of her pension from the Mexican Government, which had been granted her on the death of her husband, and of which, in consequence of the existing war, she had been deprived. Her object was to have it reserved and paid out of the military contribution levied by our forces in Mexico. I gave her no distinct answer, but told her I would see the Secretary of State on the subject, and requested her to call on him to-morrow. I do not see how I can grant her request. Upon the death of her husband she left Mexico, and has been residing for the past 20 years near Philadelphia, and has received her annual pension from Mexico during that period, until the breaking out of the present war, by which she has been deprived of it. She is an interesting person. One of her sons was a Major in the Mexican Army, was recently taken prisoner, & (is) now in the U. S. on his parole of honour. (*Diary*, III, 342.)

Madame Iturbide requested Buchanan to "give her a *written permission* for herself and family to return to Mexico". Bu-

chanan "submitted her note to the President, who has reluctantly arrived at the conclusion that it would, under existing circumstances, be inexpedient to grant her permission". Feb'y 24, 1848. (*Works*, VII, p. 505.)

In the March number of the RECORDS (p. 40), it is stated that the Empress died at Philadelphia "on the 21st of January, 1861". Mr. Griffin assigns a slightly later date. He writes: "On March 16th, 1861, Madame Anna Marie Haurte de Iturbide, ex-Empress of Mexico, died, age seventy-nine. She was interred on March 23rd in vault No. 9 of St. John's Church, Philadelphia. On December 14, 1866, her son Augustus Iturbide, born 30 September, 1807, died and was buried in No. 9." The Vault Record of St. John's Church gives the date of the interment of the Empress as 21 March, 1861 (RECORDS, Dec., 1912).

A splendidly illustrated souvenir volume has been issued to signalize the Silver Jubilee of the opening of the Roman Catholic High School for Boys of Philadelphia. It gives an interesting sketch of the founder of the School, Mr. Thomas E. Cahill, a description of the building, and an account of the ceremonies at the blessing of the school, 6 September, 1890, including the addresses delivered by the late Judge Elcock, Bishop Horstmann and Archbishop Ryan. A number of highly instructive statistical tables are given, from which we learn that, since the opening of the school, 4,762 boys were admitted, of whom 1,032 finished the complete course and received the honors of graduation. Nearly one-fourth of the graduates (240, to be exact) pursued their studies in some higher institution of learning. Among the Alumni are 52 clergymen, 43 seminarians, 48 physicians and dentists, 25 lawyers, 17 Bachelors of Science, and a lesser number in other departments of learning.

The Reverend Lawrence J. Kenny, S.J., of St. Louis University, writes as follows to the Editor:

DEAR SIR:—

The diary of the Trappist priest, now appearing in your publication, has very special interest to students of the early history of this section. The translation is so excellently done that it is unfortunate that it should be marred by an error worth noting. I believe you will be pleased to have your attention called to the point, all the more as the mistake may yet be corrected before the general index of the volume appears.

I have before me the baptismal records of St. Ferdinand, Florissant, Missouri, in which the name of Father Dunand is signed more than two hundred and fifty times in his own hand. The third letter of his name is unmistakably N, not R, that is, his name is Dunand, not Durand.

It may be interesting to note, as agreeing with the article in your RECORDS, that his first entry is dated Dec. 28th, 1808, when he performed four baptisms; his second entry is June 8th, 1809; his last signature is on April 25th, 1820. His writing, though not so perfect as Fr. Bernard Langlois, or Fr. Urbain, is clear and easily legible. There can be no doubt that his name was Dunand.

Your servant in Christ,

LAWRENCE J. KENNY, S.J.

10-15-1817

Dunand

Mr. James Willcox has presented to the library of the Society a welcome relic of Cardinal Newman, in the shape of a cloth-bound copy of the 29th edition (Oxford, John Henry Parker, 1846, 310 pp.) of Keble's volume of hymns, "The Christian Year". The book was presented to Mr. Willcox's father in Rome, 1847, by the great Oratorian.

On the fly-leaf is the following inscription in the Cardinal's delicate handwriting:

The author of this book is Mr. Keble, formerly Fellow of Oriel College and Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. J. H. N. Coll. Urban, April 19, 1847.

Mr. Willcox has had a leather case made for this precious volume, which the Society gratefully adds to its small, but growing, collection of relics of famous churchmen.

FRANCIS X. REUSS

The following autobiographical notes were found among the papers of the late Mr. Francis X. Reuss, together with instructions to forward them to the American Catholic Historical Society. Mr. Reuss was one of the charter members of the Society and a frequent and valued contributor to the pages of the RECORDS.

Francis X. Reuss, son of Hilary Edward and Anna Barbara Reuss, born 30 November, 1847, in house at S. W. Cor. of 4th and Cherry St., Columbia, Lancaster Co., Penna. First school, at age of 3 years, to Deborah Harry, in the old frame building on Cherry St., Columbia, which stood on the Corrigan property; from here he went to another private school on Cherry St., in the frame house of Miss Katts. In 1852 he went to school in the old frame school, in the rear of the Presbyterian Church, on 4th Street, taught by Miss Rosa Gannon.

1853-1854: To Aunt Deborah Harry's private school, in the rear of the Old Friend's Meeting House, Cherry St.

1855-1856: Private school kept by William Gleaves, in Town Hall, Columbia.

1857: To private Academy, "Washington Institute", one of the first pupils in the then newly erected Academy, opened by Prof. Joseph D. Nichols, until 1863, when it was used as a hospital after the battle of Gettysburg.

1863: Studied photography under R. J. M. Little, Columbia, Pa.

1864: Working at photography under Charles Z. Crane, 532 Arch St., Philadelphia; also in the Sanitary Fair building, in Logan Square, Phila.

1865: Photography with B. F. Reimer galleries, Phila.

1866: Entered St. Vincent's College (O.S.B.), at Beatty's, Westmoreland Co., Pa., until June, 1869.

1869: Family moved to Phila., in March.

1869: Sept., in New York: Baritone in Church of the Immaculate Conception, 14th St. & Avenue A; also teaching piano at Renz and Jobin Studio, until 1871.

1871: Baritone at St. Francis' Church, Phila.

1872: Baritone at St. Patrick's Church, Phila.

1873: Director of Choir at St. James' Church, Phila.

1874: Baritone of Second Quartette, Caroline Riching's Opera Company, and Director of Chorus, until 1880.

1880: Director of St. James' Choir; also teaching piano.

1884: One of the Founders and Charter Members of the American Catholic Historical Society—1st Corresponding Secretary and Librarian—3rd Recording Secretary—Chairman Public Meeting Committee, 1885-86; Secretary of Research Committee, 189—; Transcription of the baptismal and marriage Records of St. Joseph's Church, Phila.—1758-1775.

1886: Author of History of the Congregation of Jesus and Mary.

1886: Author of History of St. Peter's Church, Columbia, Pa., Part I.

1887: Author of History of St. Peter's Church, Columbia, Pa., Part II.

1887: Author of Sketch (Historical) of St. James' Church.

1888: Author of History of Old St. Gregory's Church, Phila.

1896: Author of *Life of V. Rev. Charles I. H. Carter*, Phila.

1897: Author of *Life of Rev. Joseph Balfe, D.D.*, Phila.

1897: Author of *Life of Rev. Patrick Rafferty, Missionary*, Phila.

1898: Author of *Biographical Cyclopaedia of the Catholic Prelates of the United States*. Wiltzius & Co., Milwaukee, 160 pp.

1899: Author of *Prof. S. S. Haldeman as a Catholic*.

1900: Author of *Some Events Occurring at St. Charles' College, Grand Coteau, La., during the Civil War*.

1900: *Life of the Rt. Rev. James Zilliox, O.S.B., First American-born Abbot in U. S.*

1901: Author: *My Mother's Recollections of the old Church at Reading, Pa.* Phila.

1902: Author of *Life of Rev. Sylvester Eagle*, Phila.; of five short papers on Pennsylvania's Catholic Clergy; of four papers on Genealogy of the Beatty Family, Columbia, Pa.; of *The Great Fire of 1856 at Columbia, Pa. (Columbia, Pa.)*; *Some Old Manuscripts of Early Columbians*, Columbia, Pa.; *Life of Prof. William A. Newland, the Last of the Old Organists of Catholic Philadelphia*, Phila.

1903: *History of Columbia, Pa.—a history of each street—every house—and every occupant—published weekly in "The Herald", Columbia, Pa., until 1906.*

1904: *Old Columbia Schools*, Columbia, Pa.; *Translations and Transcriptions of Baptismal and Marriage Records, St. Joseph's Church, Phila., 1772-1830.*

1905: *Old Columbia School Teachers*; *Old Columbia Taxgatherers*; *Old Columbia Citizens*; *English Lutheran Church*; *Odd Fellows' Hall*; *Old Friends' Meeting House*; *Robert Houston and 1812 War*; *St. Peter's Church, Deeds for Cemetery (1826) and for Church (1828)*; *Genealogy of the Ziegler Family of Columbia. (The last two papers were printed in Philadelphia, and the others in Columbia.)*

The only full and complete History of the Epidemic of Asiatic Cholera (1854) in Columbia, Pa., with copies of the MSS. and Records of the Sanitary Committee, Reports of Physicians, etc., etc., from the original records sealed finally in 1855, and found by me, seal unbroken, after having been lost for 50 years. ("Columbia Herald", Sept., 1905, to June, 1906. Columbia, Pa.)

1906: The History of all Columbia Newspapers (1801-1905), with Biographical Sketches of Editors, Publishers and Printers, including fugitive amateur papers, Columbia, Pa.; Inscriptions from all gravestones in the ancient cemeteries: "Old Brick," 1725; Presbyterian, 1808; Friends, 1800; German Lutheran, 1805; Methodist, 1819; Pottersfield, 181—; with notes on families, Columbia, Pa.; Inscriptions from the remnants of burial stones, yet standing in St. Peter's Catholic graveyard, with notes on the families who were buried there, and those who were removed to the newer cemeteries, Columbia, Pa.

FUGITIVE ARTICLES.

Historical Notes on Old St. Patrick's Church, York, Pa., published in the *Fair Journal*, 188—.

The Account of some old Games at St. Vincent's College, Beatty's, Pa., by the Class of 1866-1869, published in the college *Journal*, 189—.

Historical Notes on "Titular Sees", as held by Catholic Bishops in the U. S., published in the "Collector", a magazine devoted to autograph collecting, 188—; Some Moody Philosophy, by Our Moody Philosopher, published in "Columbia Independent", eight articles, beginning June, 1906.

Series of Letters, to same paper, instituting "Home Week" in Penna., which resulted in the first *Home Week* celebration, held in Columbia, in 1905. There is another series on the same subject in May, 1906.

BOOK REVIEWS

OUR PHILADELPHIA. Described by Elizabeth Robins Pennell. Illustrated with one hundred and five lithographs by Joseph Pennell. Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company. MCMXIV. Pp. 552.

Our Philadelphia is not a history of Philadelphia in the ordinary meaning of the term history, though it is more readable, instructive, and stimulating than many of the books that tell in detail of the beginning, growth, development, and achievements of the Quaker City. It describes Philadelphia as the city first appeared in the 'seventies and 'eighties to a young girl and later to the same young girl grown to womanhood on her return to the home of her childhood after an absence of twenty-five years.

Joseph Pennell, the well-known artist, supplies the pictures, which are reproductions of the charming and invaluable etchings he has made of Philadelphia, past and present. Both husband and wife were admirably equipped for the task which they undertook in giving to the world, and especially to Philadelphians, *Our Philadelphia*.

Both were born in the Quaker City. And while they have traveled the world over and have described in art and literature many beautiful places for the enjoyment of their fellow countrymen, neither has lost that faithful, loyal, and devoted affection for home which ever characterizes the true citizen of a noble city.

The rapid changes within recent decades that have taken place in Philadelphia, and indeed in all of the principal American cities, while accepted as a matter of course by those who themselves have a part in the radical development, are amazing in their startling and sweeping character to those who return home after living a quarter of a century in foreign lands. The authors of *Our Philadelphia* experienced this sensation of surprise, and perhaps disap-

pointment, as they gazed upon the scenes of their earlier years and noted that much of the old had disappeared and that a new order, though likely not a better order, had come into existence.

It is certain from the dominant tone in *Our Philadelphia*, that Mrs. Pennell believes her native city has lost many of those qualities which made the city so charming and attractive, at the beginning of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Furthermore, she intimates that one of the causes of this regrettable loss has been the incoming in large numbers of the obtrusive foreigner who has preempted in an emphatic way those districts which were looked upon as the exclusive habitat of the true Philadelphian.

Mrs. Pennell's actual views are best understood in her own words. She says:

I confess to a good deal of emotion as the train slowed up in the Pennsylvania Station, and I think I had a right to it. It is not every day one comes home after a quarter of a century absence.

I did not have to go farther than my hotel for a reminder that Philadelphia, to oblige me, had not stood altogether still during my quarter of a century absence, but had been, and was, busy refashioning itself into something preposterously new. . . .

Vanished were old landmarks for which I confidently looked. . . .

Change, change, change—that was what I had come home for!

I am not sure, however, that I had not the worst shock of all when I wandered from the old home, further down Spruce Street, below the beautiful Eighteenth Century Hospital. As I had left it, this lower part of Spruce and Pine and the neighboring streets had changed, less perhaps than any other part of the town has changed, less today in mere bricks and mortar.

It had preserved the appropriate background for its inheritance of history and traditions; numerous colonial houses re-

mained. It had kept also the serenity and repose of the Quaker City's early days, the character, dignity, charm. It was clean as a little Dutch town, with nothing to interrupt the quiet but the gentle jingling of the occasional leisurely horse-car.

And what did I find it?—A slum captured by the Russian Jew, the old houses dirty, down at the heel; the once spotless marble steps unwashed, the white shutters hanging loose; the decorated old iron hinges and catches and insurance plaques or badges rusting, and nobody can say how much of the old wood work inside burned for kindling; Yiddish signs in the windows, with here a Jewish Maternity House, and there a Jewish newspaper office; at every door, almost every window, and in groups in the street, men, women and children with Oriental faces, here and there a man actually in his caftan, bearded, with the little curls in front of his ears, and a woman with a handkerchief over her head, and all chattering in Yiddish and slatternly and dirty as I remember them in South Eastern Europe, from Carlsbad and Prague to those remote villages of Transylvania where dirt was the sign by which I always knew when the Jewish quarter was reached. . . .

Now when I left home, this narrow section (between the Delaware and the Schuylkill, and bounded on the north by Market Street and on the South by Lombard) was threatening to grow too narrow, and it was with some difficulty that the Philadelphians kept within it. Up till then, however, it was in no danger except from his own increasing numbers. The tragedy is that the Russian Jew should have descended upon just this section, should now, not so much dispute it with him, as oust him from it—the Russian Jew, a Jew by religion but not by race, who has been found impossible in every country on the continent of Europe into which he has drifted, so impossible when that country is Holland that the Jews who have been there for centuries collect among themselves the money to send him post haste to England and poor America, for even the Dutch Jew cannot stand the Russian Jew—and from what I have heard, neither can the decent Pennsylvania Jew who has been with us from the beginning.

It is the Russian Jew who, with an army of aliens at his back, thousands upon thousands of Italians, Slavs, Lithuanians,

fresh immigration of negroes from the South—and statistics alone can say how many other varieties—is pushing and pushing Philadelphians out of the town—first up Spruce Street, nearer and nearer to the Schuylkill, then across the Schuylkill into the suburbs, eventually to be swept from the suburbs into the country, until who can say where there will be any room for them at all?¹

I should not like to think of the new Philadelphian that is to come out of the incredible mixture of Russian Jews and countless other aliens as little like us in character and tradition. The new Philadelphian may be a finer creature far than in my hopes for him, finer far than the old Philadelphian I have known.

Personally, I might as well say that I do not believe he will be a finer creature. It seems to me that he is doing away with the old American idea of levelling up and is bent on the levelling down process that is going on all over Europe. And so foreign is he making us that I would not think “J” very far wrong in declaring himself the only real American left, if only he would include me with him.²

This picture of Philadelphia, or at least a part of Philadelphia, and the reflections of Mrs. Pennell, are interesting, especially to those whose memories go back to Philadelphia during and preceding the time of Mrs. Pennell’s girlhood. Some of the sons of the earlier immigrants can recall very vividly that the same kind of language which Mrs. Pennell uses in regard to the unlovable Russian Jew and other aliens was used by ultra-Americans in regard to the immigrants of forty and fifty years ago. The same fear that the real American would disappear and that low-bred, uncouth foreigners would ruthlessly seize his birthright was expressed when the “low, dirty” Irish and the slow, stupid, dull-witted German began to be conspicuously prominent in American life.

Mrs. Pennell’s generalization should not be accepted with unqualified approval. The fear that the City she loves may

¹ Pp. 451-467.

² Pp. 473-474.

become a foreign colony has as little foundation to-day as it had fifty years ago. For it has been said that this Quaker City which to Mrs. Pennell seems to have sadly deteriorated, because of its unwelcome foreign elements, has actually to-day less of a foreign population in proportion to the whole population than it had in those days which *Our Philadelphia* recalls with so much love and deep regret. But whether or not the native is disappearing and the foreigner is assuming the ascendant,¹ the question may be asked, was the American of the past so superior that the country suffered an irreparable loss when his place in this great Republic was shared by the strangers from across the seas? Is the American of to-day so surely enriched with all the graces and gifts of culture, and the immigrant so sadly degraded, as to warrant the contemptuous lamentations of Mr. and Mrs. Pennell that the passing of the native and the coming of the immigrant will speak disaster to America? The foreigner is not all that he ought to be; neither is the native American, even though his ancestry goes back many generations in his native land. But the plain truth is, the immigrant often has qualities which the native American lacks and when the scales are balanced it is wholly probable that the foreigner gives to America as much as America gives to him. Many a poor immigrant to-day as in the past, not because he is arrogant or self-assertive, but because he is self-respecting, resents the patronizing attitude of those who betray in word and deed that they look upon him as a creature who sadly needs the

¹ As a matter of fact the foreign population of Philadelphia in proportion to the total population is lower to-day than it was fifty years ago. The eminent statistician, Dr. Edward Cattell, makes the following tabulation.

1860: Total Population	565,529	
Foreign Population	169,430	
Percentage of Foreign-born		30
1890: Total Population	1,046,964	
Foreign Population	268,249	
Percentage of Foreign-born		25.6
1910: Total Population	1,549,008	
Foreign Population	382,578	
Percentage of Foreign-born		24.7

domination of those who possess the admirable equipment for the uplifting and elevating of the multitudes of strangers who crowd our large American cities. It is almost time for those who give thought to the great problem of our foreign population, to abandon this attitude of patronage and depreciation and candidly recognize the many admirable qualities which the immigrant, with all his limitations, possesses.

The social life of Philadelphia as it was lived by the so-called aristocratic families of more than thirty years ago, affords much material for *Our Philadelphia*. Certain chapters, therefore, will make agreeable reading for those who lay claim to belonging to the privileged groups of the city's population.

Two interesting chapters for Catholics are "At the Convent" and "A Question of Creed". To appreciate both chapters, one should recall that Mrs. Pennell's father, Mr. Edward Robins, was a convert, and was baptized with his two daughters. One of these was Mrs. Pennell, who was eight years old at the time. The Convent in question is the Academy of the Sacred Heart, at Eden Hall, Torresdale, Pennsylvania. It is the same convent that Miss Agnes Repplier describes in *Our Convent Days*. Indeed, Miss Repplier and Mrs. Pennell were pupils together at the Academy, and the latter is the Elizabeth of *Our Convent Days*.

Mrs. Pennell makes some facetious comments upon the education received under the direction of the Mesdames of the Sacred Heart; nevertheless, she declares:

Seriously, the training did give something that nothing else could, and an admirable training it was, for which girls to-day might exchange more than one brain-bewildering course at College and be none the worse for it.

In my own case, I admit I should not mind having had more of the other training, as it turned out that my work in life is of the sort where a quiet intelligence counts for more than an elegant deportment. But I can find no fault with the Convent for neglect. Girls then were not educated to work.

A young graduate from Bryn Mawr said to me some few days ago, that when she looked at her mother and the women of her mother's generation and realized all that they had accomplished without what is now called education, she wondered whether the girls of her generation, who had the benefit of all the excess of education going, would or could accomplish more, or as much.

To tell the truth, I wonder myself. But, then, it may be said that I, belonging to that older generation, am naturally prejudiced.¹

The Chapter, "A Question of Creed", reveals the attitude of the Philadelphi non-Catholic towards the Catholic Church and her children in the period about the Centennial. The time is not too far away to forbid many now living comparing their own judgment of this ostracism with that described by Mrs. Pennell. Mrs. Pennell says:

In France, in Louisiana, in Maryland, to be a Catholic was to be at the top of the social scale, approved by society; in Pennsylvania, it was to be at the bottom, despised by society.²

After religious passions had run their course, the religious prejudice against the Catholics was handed down as social prejudice, which was all it was in my day when Philadelphians, who would question the social standing of a Catholic in Philadelphia simply because he was a Catholic, could accept him without question in the Catholic town of Baltimore or New Orleans simply because he was one. The Catholic continued to pay a heavy price socially for his religion in Philadelphia, where it was not the thing to be a Catholic; where it never had been the thing; where it got to be less the thing as successive immigration crowded the Catholic Churches. I fancy at the period of which I am writing, Philadelphians, if asked, would have said that Catholicism was for Irish servants and for the illiterate.³

One thing plain was that when we children went off to our church with my father, we were going where nobody else in my grandfather's house went except the servants.⁴

¹ Pp. 100, 101.

² Pp. 175.

³ Pp. 177, 178.

⁴ Pp. 181.

When eventually I left school and began going out on my modest scale, I could not fail to see that the people I met in Church were not, as a rule, the people I met at the Dancing Class, or at parties, or at receptions, or at that abominable round of morning calls, and this was the more surprising because Philadelphians of the Chestnut, Walnut, Spruce and Pine set were accustomed to meeting each other wherever they went.

Mrs. Pennell's description of old St. Joseph's, Willings Alley, brings back the names of many of the old Jesuits who were well known thirty years ago to Philadelphia Catholics.

The priests (of St. Joseph's), Jesuits, were mostly Italians. There was Father De Maria, tall, thin, with a wonderful stock of white hair, a fine ascetic face and a kindly smile not adapted to shine in children's society—too much of a scholar, I fancied, though I may have been wrong. And with an effect of severity which I do not think he meant, but which had kept me at a safe distance when he came to see us at Torresdale.

There was Father Ardea, a small, shrinking, dark man, from whom it was more comfortable to keep at a safe distance, so little had he to say and such a trick of looking at you with an "Eh? Eh?" of expectation, as if he relied upon you to supply the talk he had not at his own command. But I could have forgiven him worse, so pleasant a duty did he make of confession. His penances were light and his only comment was, "Eh? Eh? My child, but you didn't mean it. You didn't mean it!" until I longed to accuse myself of the Seven Deadly Sins with the unpardonable sin thrown in, just to see if he would still accuse me that "I didn't mean it".

There was Father Bobelin—our corruption, I fancy, of Barbelin—a Frenchman, short and fat, sandy-haired, with a round smiling face, the most welcome of all.¹

Now and then Jesuits who gave missions and who had conducted retreats at the Convent appeared at St. Joseph's—Father Samarius, the huge Dutchman, so enormous, they used to tell us at the Convent that he had never seen his feet for twenty years. . . .²

¹ P. 192.

² P. 193.

Philadelphia had got beyond the exciting stage of intolerance before I was born. Only the social prejudice survived, but it was the more bitter to fight because, whether the end was victory or defeat, it appeared so inglorious a struggle to be engaged in.

One good result there was of this social ostracism. Religion, I have often heard it said, is a matter of temperament. The necessary temperament is not to be had by any effort of will power, depending rather upon "the influence of the unknown powers". But I am not totally blind, nor was I in the old days when, many were the things I did not see, my eyes were still open to the effect of social opposition on Catholics with the temperament. It made them more devout, at times more defiant.

This is why the Philadelphian who, in spite of the social price paid, remained faithful, was the most devout Catholic I have ever met at home or in my wanderings.¹

But a change came over the city in its religious, social, and material life. The social ostracism of Catholics lost some of its exclusiveness. Many causes contributed to this modified attitude of non-Catholics towards Catholics. Mrs. Pennell thinks it was

the Cathedral that did most to weaken the social prejudice against Catholics. The Bishop there was Bishop Wood; and Bishop Wood, like my Father, a convert, was no Irish immigrant, no Italian missionary, but came from the same old family of Philadelphia Friends as J.

With his splendid presence and splendid voice, he must have added dignity to every service at the Cathedral, but he did more than that: he gave it the sanction of Philadelphian respectability. The Catholic was no longer quite without Philadelphia's social pale.

I had no opportunity, because of my long absence, to watch the gradual breakdown, but I saw that the barrier had fallen when I got back to Philadelphia. Never again will Philadelphia children think they are doing an odd thing when they go to Mass, never again need the Philadelphia girl, fresh from the convent, fancy herself alone in the yawning gulf of evil that opens at the convent gate. I should not be surprised if an

¹ P. 199.

eligible man from the Dancing Class or Assembly list can to-day be picked up at the door of more than one Catholic Church for the Sunday Walk on Walnut Street.¹

It need hardly be said that, interesting as Mrs. Pennell's views are of the Philadelphia that is past, they fall short in conveying a complete and accurate knowledge of the real city, the population of which, even in 1870, was almost 700,000. An instance of this limitation is in the very chapter from which the preceding extracts have been made. Mrs. Pennell states truly that Catholics were socially ostracized. She saw the discrimination, though she was not one of its victims. Now that we have learned from a reliable authority the attitude of non-Catholics towards Catholics, it would be highly illuminating to know the attitude of Catholics towards non-Catholics.

It is probable that non-Catholics thought that their own superiority and the inferiority of Catholics were sufficient causes for the discrimination. It is likewise possible they may have assumed that Catholics recognized the superiority of non-Catholics, and the inferiority of Catholics, and accepted the state of affairs as a matter of course. But perhaps if one who knew the great Catholic body of those days as intimately as Mrs. Pennell knew the exclusive non-Catholic set, it might be discovered that the lowly Catholics of the 'seventies and 'eighties were not overwhelmed by the impressive dignity of those who prided themselves upon a colonial ancestry and a fashionable religious creed.

If a criticism were in order about a book that will richly repay careful reading, it would be that perhaps the shock which Mr. Pennell and Mrs. Pennell experienced when they saw the changes in their beloved home city, may have prevented them from seeing clearly the actual truth and interpreting accurately the significance of what happened in their twenty-five years absence.

It should be said that the book is printed in the admirable style that characterizes the publications of the Lippincotts.

P. R. McDEVITT.

¹ P. 203.

190^a



THE RIGHT REV. PHILIP R. McDEVITT
Bishop-Elect of Harrisburg, Pa.
Twice President of American Catholic Historical Society

RECORDS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOL. XXVII

SEPTEMBER, 1916

No. 3

THE CAPUCHINS IN ACADIA AND NORTHERN MAINE (1632-1655)

REV. JOHN LENHART, O. M. Cap.

In the earliest period of American history, the name *Acadia* designated a territory of uncertain extent. Its limits were never exactly defined, but during the seventeenth century it denoted that part of North America lying southeast of the River St. Lawrence, comprising the present provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, and the northern part of the State of Maine. The Kennebec River up to 1656, and later, the Penobscot River formed the boundary line between the French and English possessions.¹ The origin and meaning

¹ M. Moreau, *Histoire de l'Acadie Française de 1598 à 1755*, Paris, 1873, pp. 1-2. Sam. Edw. Dawson, *The Saint Lawrence: Its Basin and Border-Lands. The Story of their Discovery*, New York, 1905, p. 250. Charles C. Smith (in Justin Winsor's *Narrative and Critical History of America*, Vol. IV), *French Explorations and Settlements in North America*, Boston and New York, 1884, p. 135. Rochemonteix, S. J., *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France au XVII^e siècle*, I, Paris, 1895, pp. 1-2. *Collection de Manuscrits relatifs à la Nouvelle-France*, I, Quebec, 1883, pp. 14-19, 26-29. Bourinot, *Story of Canada*, New York, 1896, p. 5.

of the word has been much discussed. The opinion generally held by American writers is that it is derived from the Micmac word *akade*, signifying a *place* or *locality*.² Acadia was first settled by the French in 1604. Its subsequent history is a continuous record of sad and unfortunate accidents. It was three times conquered by the English and three times restored to France.³ When the English took possession of Acadia in 1628, and when Canada became an English possession the following year, there were scarcely one hundred Frenchmen in the whole of Canada.⁴ From the year 1615, when Champlain brought out four Recollect Friars to Quebec, to 1629, when the English captured the colony at Quebec, the Recollects were the pioneer missionaries of Canada and Acadia. They were assisted by the Jesuits from 1625 till 1629 in their missionary field of Canada. The missions of both the Recollects and the Jesuits were abandoned in 1629, when all the missionaries were taken as prisoners to England. A mere handful of Indian converts was the total result of their long and zealous labors, and these they were compelled to leave exposed to the danger of relapsing into paganism. The French settlers who were then scattered throughout Canada and Acadia, had likewise no Catholic priest to minister to their spiritual wants.⁵ Both Canada and Acadia were occupied by the English until 1632. Richelieu, however, had not abandoned New France. He had exerted the full pressure of his power for the recovery of the lost province. In

² Dawson, *op. cit.*, pp. 249-250; Bourinot, *op. cit.*, p. 5, note.

³ Moreau, *op. cit.*, pp. v-vi.

⁴ Dawson, *op. cit.*, p. 287; Moreau, p. 108; Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World*, Boston, 1865, pp. 387-411.

⁵ Dawson, *op. cit.*, pp. 295-300; Parkman, *Pioneers*, pp. 357-369, 391-394, 402-411; Sagard, *Histoire du Canada*, Paris, 1636, p. 1001; John G. Shea, in Winsor, *Narr. and Crit. History*, IV, pp. 264-266, 290-292; Rochemonteix, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 172-176.

signing the treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye, March 29, 1632, England resigned her prize and surrendered to France all the places occupied by the English within the limits of Canada and Acadia.⁶ If those who controlled the destiny of France could have risen to the height of Henry IV or Richelieu, North America would now be a French continent,⁷ and we may add, a Catholic continent.

When England reluctantly yielded up New France in 1632, the all-powerful Cardinal Richelieu seems to have looked with no kindly eye on the religious Orders who had already labored to evangelize these American regions. His first thought was to replace both Orders, the Recollects and the Jesuits, by his own favorite Order, the Capuchins. Shortly afterward he offered the missions of Canada and Acadia to them.⁸ Richelieu was swayed in this predilection for the Capuchins by those signal services which the latter had rendered his political cause. We cannot speak of the statesman Richelieu without mentioning the Capuchin Father Joseph.

François Leclerc du Tremblay entered the Capuchin Order in 1599, taking the name Joseph of Paris.⁹ As Père Joseph, he became famous throughout Europe.¹⁰

⁶ Moreau, pp. 108-109; Dawson, p. 416; Parkman, *op. cit.*, pp. 412-414; Rochemonteix, I, pp. 179-181.

⁷ Dawson, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

⁸ Shea, in Winsor, IV, p. 266; Dawson, p. 301; Rochemonteix, I, p. 182.

⁹ The Capuchins still retain the mediæval custom of dropping their family name in official communications.

¹⁰ Cf. Goyau, in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, IX, New York, 1910, p. 108.—*Additional Bibliography.* Franciscus Andegavensis (of Angers) O. M. Cap., *Vita et Acta Josephi Le Clerc, Capucini*, Paris, 1645. *Vie de Joseph Le Clerc, Capucin*, Paris, 1645. Richard, *Histoire de la vie du Père Joseph Le Clerc du Tremblay, Capucin*, Paris, 1702, 2 vols., and *Réponse au livre intitulé Le véritable Père Joseph*, Paris, 1704; *A defence against the anonymous book: Le véritable Père Joseph, Capucin*. St. Jean de Maurienne (Rouen), 1704. Rocco (Cocchia) da Cesinale

When Richelieu was summoned to put his hand to the helm of State, he asked the Pope and the King of France to give him the Capuchin Friar Joseph as a helper in the work which lay before him. This celebrated association of the Cardinal and the Capuchin was to last fifteen years (1623-1638). Richelieu himself called Père Joseph "his right hand". He used to remark facetiously of his great friend and advisor Père Joseph: "No minister or plenipotentiary in Europe could pull the beard of that Capuchin".¹¹ No religious from the time of Cardinal Ximenes had wielded as much political power as this confidant of Richelieu. No treaty was concluded in which he did not take part. Nuncios, ambassadors, and envoys never conferred with the king or the Cardinal without first laying the matter before the Capuchin Friar. When not present at Court, these ambassadors went to meet him in the different monasteries where he lived. The instructions handed to the ambassadors, to the Secretaries of State, and to the generals were signed in his own name. Momentous political transactions were ratified by the subscription: *Père Joseph*. And this

O. Cap., *Storia delle Missioni dei Cappuccini*, I, Paris, 1867, pp. 175-202, 491-496; Vol. II, Roma, 1872, pp. 317-362. Parmentier, *De Patris Josephi Capucini publica vita, qualis ex ejus cum Richelio commerciis appareat*, Thesis, Paris, 1877. Castonnet des Fosses, *Le Père Joseph, sa vie religieuse*, Angers, 1887. Hyacinthe de Reims O. Cap., *Remarques sur les vertus et la mort du Père Joseph Le Clerc du Tremblay, publiées d'après un Ms. du XVII^e siècle*, Calais, 1888. Dedouvres, *Le Père Joseph du Tremblay. Notice biographique d'après le Sieur de Hautebresche. Essai bibliographique*, Angers, 1889. Apollinaire O. Cap., *Le Père Joseph*, Nîmes, 1894. Dedouvres, *De Patris Josephi Turciados libris quinque*, Angers, 1894. *Quatre opuscules du Père Joseph du Tremblay*, publiés par Apollinaire de Valence O. Cap., Nîmes, 1895 (contains an autobiography of Père Joseph). Dedouvres, *Le Père Joseph. Appendice des Oeuvres polémiques du Père Joseph*, Angers, 1896. Dedouvres, *Le Père Joseph. Études critiques sur ses oeuvres spirituelles*, Paris, 1903. O'Connor, *His Grey Eminence*, Philadelphia, 1912.

¹¹ O'Connor, pp. 56-58; Cesinale, II, pp. 326, 328; Campbell, S.J., *Pioneer Priests of North America*, III, N. Y., 1911, p. 2.

"singular man", as Voltaire calls him, lived through it all the austere life of a Capuchin friar. Barefooted and clad in a simple habit, he mingled amongst the diplomats as their equal. Four of his brother-Capuchins acted as his secretaries. He was never known to ask favors for himself nor for his Order. All his political influence was exerted with the single purpose of gaining missionary fields for his confrères.¹² As the founder of the Capuchin missions at home and abroad, Père Joseph left behind him an enduring monument to his own zeal and created a source of the most permanent and beneficial results to America. He was above all things a great missionary. He made use of political influence, diplomatic interests, and statecraft as a means to this end. By the Capuchin missions he promoted the unification and expansion of France. In 1617, Père Joseph established the Capuchin missions among the Protestants of France, and these missionaries restored Catholicism to Languedoc, a region covering one-sixth of France, where it has been practically stamped out by the Huguenots.¹³ In the West, in the provinces of Poitou, Aunis, Saintonge, Angoumois, and Anjou, the Capuchins converted one hundred thousand Protestants.¹⁴ Similar results were achieved in other provinces, and Richelieu expressed his conviction that in two years (1628) there would be no longer any Huguenots in France.¹⁵

¹² Cesinale, I, p. 175; II, pp. 328, 360-361.

¹³ O'Connor, *op. cit.*, pp. 68, 70, 79; Cesinale, I, p. 187.

¹⁴ Cesinale, II, p. 322.

¹⁵ O'Connor, p. 80. On these Capuchin missions, *cf.* Cesinale, I, pp. 180-202; II, pp. 317-362. O'Connor, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-81. *Analecta Ord. Min. Capuccinor*, Vol. IV, Romae, 1888, pp. 125-127, 140-145. *Conversions signalées par les Pères Capucins de Poitou*, Paris, 1620. Douais, *Capucins et Huguenots dans le Languedoc*, p. i (unica), Lyons, 1888. Apollinaire O. M. Cap., *Capucins et Huguenots à Montpellier 1609-1622*, in *Revue du Midi*, Nîmes, Avril 1893, pp. 321-339. Apollinaire de Valence O. M. Cap., *Missions catholiques dans les Cévennes, 1622-1629*, in *Bulletin de l'Art chrét.*, Nîmes, 1896.

However eager Père Joseph might have been for the conversion of French heretics, that which appealed most to his apostolic zeal were the foreign missions.¹⁶ Italian Capuchins began foreign missions in 1551. French Capuchins had entered the same field in 1611, at Maranhao in Brazil.¹⁷ From 1622 onwards, Père Joseph founded in rapid succession French Capuchin Missions which extended from Persia to America. He could have never realized this vast plan of operations, had it not been for the powerful protection of the French king, and the assistance of the French ministers of State. From 1622 till 1632, Père Joseph established Capuchin Missions in England, Turkey, Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Persia, Palestine, Egypt, Abyssinia, Morocco, and Tunis.¹⁸ In 1632, he sent his confrères to Acadia, and three years later to the West Indies. Père Joseph was nominated Prefect-Apostolic of all the French Capuchin Missions in 1623. His many occupations gave him little time to attend to this office, and another Capuchin, Father Leonard of Paris, was appointed assistant Prefect-Apostolic.¹⁹ Once a week, sometimes oftener, Père Joseph passed a day in the Capuchin monastery at Paris to assist Father Leonard in the direction of the Capuchin Missions.²⁰

The foundation of a Capuchin Mission in North America, however, does not owe its origin to the plans of Richelieu or of Père Joseph. The initiative was taken by the Papal Nuncio at Brussels. The Belgian Nuncio had informed the Roman authorities of the dangers threatening

¹⁶ O'Connor, p. 85; Cesinale, II, p. 329.

¹⁷ Cesinale, I, p. 49 sqq., 440-470.

¹⁸ O'Connor, pp. 85-90; Cesinale, II and III, *passim*. An extensive bibliography is extant on these missions.

¹⁹ Apollinaire de Valence O. Cap., *Trois Lettres du P. Pacifique de Provins*, Rome, 1890, p. 13 sq.; Cesinale, II, p. 329.

²⁰ Cesinale, II, p. 361.

the Catholic emigrants to North America, and Propaganda accordingly (November 22, 1630) directed Père Joseph to establish a Capuchin Mission in New England in order to "impede the progress of Puritanism and to minister to the Catholic settlers". Both French and English-speaking Capuchins were to be sent to the New England Mission.²¹ Nine months before Père Joseph had opened a Capuchin Mission in England. Twelve Capuchins had been sent to London (February 24, 1630) and they were given quarters in the Royal Palaces of St. James and Somerset House. Propaganda evidently felt confident that Père Joseph could succeed just as well in New England as in Old England.²²

Cesinale states that in obedience to Propaganda, the zealous director of the French Capuchin Missions sent some of his brethren of the Paris Province to New England.²³ I am inclined to doubt this very much. Père Joseph knew all about the negotiations Richelieu had conducted with the London Cabinet regarding the restoration of New France, and he certainly must have waited for the final settlement between the two Crowns. At all events, we have no particulars about the Capuchin Mission to New England during the years 1630 to 1632. Jeron²⁴ is of the opinion that Propaganda ordered Père Joseph to organize a Capuchin Mission to Acadia in 1630. But this is clearly a mistake. The New England for which the Propaganda provided a Mission in 1630 did not comprise Acadia. This

²¹ *Acta S. Congr. de Propag. Fide*, d. 22 Nov. 1630, p. 154r (quoted by Cesinale, III, p. 675, note). Urbano Cerri, *Relatione dello stato della Congregazione e Missioni di Propaganda Fide*, Ms. 283, in the "Corsiana", p. 223 (Cesinale, II, p. 40, note; III, p. 675, note).

²² Cyprien de Gamaches O. Cap., *Mémoires de la Mission des Capuchins près la Reine d'Angleterre* (1630-1669), publ. par Apollinaire de Valence O. Cap., Paris, 1881, pp. 10-24.

²³ *Storia delle Missioni dei Cappuccini*, III, p. 674.

²⁴ The Capuchins in America, in *Historical Records and Studies of the U. S. Catholic Historical Society*, Vol. V, New York, 1909, p. 289.

is proven by the fact that two years later the prefects of the French Capuchin Missions, Père Joseph and Père Leonard, asked for an extension of the New England Mission to New France. This request was granted by Propaganda on September 24, 1632.

Richelieu, as we have remarked, had first offered the missions of New France to the Capuchins, immediately after the Treaty of St. Germain. He was determined, moreover, to send only one Religious Order to Canada. "He had decided," says Faillon,²⁵ "that it would be more advantageous to the new Colonies to have only Religious of one Order in each colony, so that greater harmony, union, and submission could be established among the missionaries." The Capuchins, however, did not comply with Richelieu's plan, for, prompted by a sense of the highest delicacy, at Rochemonteix states,²⁶ "they refused to accept this mission, which in their opinion ought rightfully to be restored to the two Orders expelled from Quebec by the English." The Capuchins even made representations on behalf of those Orders. In the *Lettres patentes* given to the Jesuits who embarked for Canada (April 18, 1632), Richelieu himself says: "Having charged the Sieur Guillaume de Caen by contract of January 20, 1632, to take three Capuchins to Quebec, and the Capuchin Fathers, having represented to us since that the Jesuits had labored already in those places and that it would be, therefore, more reasonable to send them back to those places than to replace them by Capuchins, and the Capuchins having excused themselves with these same reasons, we order that three Jesuits should return to Quebec."²⁷

²⁵ *Histoire de la colonie française en Canada*, I, Montreal, 1865, p. 279.

²⁶ *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVII^e siècle*, I, Paris, 1895, p. 182.

²⁷ Rochemonteix, I, p. 183; Dawson, p. 301.

Upon the refusal of the Capuchins to take entire charge of the Mission of New France, Richelieu formed the project of sending missionaries of the three Orders to Canada and Acadia, and on May 31, 1632, Propaganda gave its approbation to the new Canadian missions of the Franciscans, Jesuits, and Capuchins.²⁸ The Jesuits had expected that they would be restored to their former mission. The final decision was announced to them at the end of March, and they were ready to set out for Canada on April 18, 1632. The Franciscans were not able to go within such a short time and when they asked later on for admittance they were refused.²⁹

The Capuchins accepted their share of the Acadian Mission at once.³⁰ On March 27, 1632, Richelieu ordered Isaac de Launoy de Razilly to take possession of Acadia.³¹ The

²⁸ *Acta S. Congr. de Prop. Fide*, May 31, 1632, p. 66r (quoted by Cesinale, III, p. 676, note 3).

²⁹ Rochemonteix, S. J., I, p. 182-188; Campbell, *Pioneer Priests*, III, pp. 2-3.

³⁰ *Literature on the Capuchin Missions in Acadia*. Rocco (Cocchia) da Cesinale O. Cap., *Storia delle Missioni dei Cappuccini*, Tom. III, Roma, 1873, pp. 673-680. Candide O. Cap., *Port-Royal en 1650*, in *La Nouvelle-France*, Vol. V, Quebec, 1906, pp. 330-339. Candide O. Cap., *À propos d'une légende: Siège du fort de la rivière Saint-Jean, 1645*, in *La Nouv.-France*, VII, Quebec, 1908, pp. 325-332. Candide O. Cap., *Silhouettes de Missionnaires: Le Père Leonard de Chartres* (O. M. Cap., killed 1655 in Acadia), in *La Nouv.-France*, X, Quebec, 1911, pp. 316-323. Otto Jeron O. Cap., *The Capuchins in America*, in *Historical Records and Studies of the U. St. Catholic Historical Society*, Vol. V, New York, 1909, pp. 288-299. Moreau, *Histoire de l'Acadie Française de 1598 à 1755*, Paris, 1873, pp. 108-269, *passim*. Rameau, *Une Colonie Féodale en Amérique (L'Acadie, 1604-1710)*, Paris, 1877, pp. 66-111, *passim*. John G. Shea, *Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, New York, 1886, pp. 236-240, 243. Thom. O'Gorman, *History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States*, New York, 1895, pp. 130-132, 134. *Jesuit Relations* (edit. Thwaites), II, pp. 175, 229; V, p. 275; VIII, p. 308; XXIV, p. 305; LXIX, p. 33; LXX, pp. 261, 265, 268, 287, 289; LXXI, pp. 35, 388.

³¹ The text of this convention between Richelieu and de Razilly is

King confirmed this commission on May 10, 1632, and Razilly was given the title of Commander.³² Later on, Razilly was appointed Governor or Lieutenant-General of the whole of Acadia.³³ Isaac de Razilly was a scion of an old and noble family of Touraine. He and his two brothers had gained renown in the service of the French marine. "The commander Razilly," writes Champlain, "has all the qualities of an experienced sea-captain, and is ardent to plant the cross in New France." Isaac Razilly was a Knight of Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem or Knight of Malta. He had been appointed (1632) commander of the galleys of his Order of Malta.³⁴ Richelieu had stipulated in his contract with Razilly that the latter should take three Capuchins with him to Acadia.³⁵ The new Commander equipped two ships, instead of the one called for by his agreement with Richelieu, and when he was about to leave, six Capuchins embarked with him.³⁶ Père Joseph, who had been instrumental in his appointment, and Leonard of Paris were nominated Joint-Prefects of the Acadian Capuchin Mission by a decree of Propaganda dated May 31, 1632. The remarkable thing about this nomination is the fact that the negotiations with Propaganda were conducted by the French Papal Nuncio and not by the Procurator of the Capuchin Order.³⁷ Finally, on September 24, 1632, Propaganda extended the Capuchin Mission of

printed in *Collection de Manuscrits relatifs à la Nouv.-France*, I, Quebec, 1883, pp. 85-86. Moreau, p. 111; Rameau, pp. 62-63; Massachusetts Archives: *Documents Collected in France*, I, p. 545.

³² Text in *Collection*, I, p. 110; Moreau, p. 116; Massachusetts Archives: *Doc. Coll. in France*, I, pp. 584-586; Winsor, IV, pp. 142-143.

³³ Moreau, p. 116; Winsor, I. c.

³⁴ Moreau, pp. 112-113; Bourinot, p. 97.

³⁵ *Collection*, I, p. 86; Moreau, p. 115; Rameau, pp. 63, 66.

³⁶ Moreau, pp. 114-115; Cesinale, III, p. 676; Jeron, p. 290.

³⁷ Cesinale, III, p. 676; Jeron, p. 290.

New England to New France in compliance with the petition of the two Prefects.³⁸

The missionaries in New France were to be supported by the *Company of One Hundred Associates*. This commercial corporation was Richelieu's creation. It was established (April 29, and May 7, 1627) for the purpose of advancing French colonization schemes and of overthrowing the predominance of the Huguenots in New France. Only Catholic Frenchmen were allowed to settle in the new colony. The *Company* was bound to support at least three priests in every new settlement; to furnish them with lodging, provisions, clothing and all things necessary for their temporal welfare and for the discharge of their spiritual ministrations.³⁹ In order to place a strong constraint upon the associate members to meet their obligations, Richelieu placed himself at the head of the enterprise. The statutes of the new *Company* were confirmed by the King in May, 1628, but before the new system was fairly installed, the English captured Port Royal (1628) and Quebec (1629).⁴⁰ In 1632, at the time of the re-occupation of New France by the French, these stipulations of 1627 regarding the support of the missionaries were renewed.⁴¹ On July 4, 1632, Razilly set out from Morbihan for Acadia. His two ships, the *L'Espérance en Dieu* and the *Saint-Jean*, carried three hundred persons, among whom were six Capuchins.⁴² Rameau betrays a gross ignorance of the Capuchin Order

³⁸ *Acta S. Cong. de Prop. Fide*, 24 Sept. 1632, p. 124 (quoted by Cesinale, III, p. 676, note 3).

³⁹ Text in *Collection I*, pp. 62-75, and in the *Histories of Canada* by Sulte, Ferland, and Garneau.

⁴⁰ Rochemonteix, I, pp. 163-165; Cesinale, III, p. 673; Parkman, *Pioneers*, ed. cit., p. 399; Moreau, p. 108; Dawson, p. 287; Bourinot, pp. 86-89.

⁴¹ Moreau, p. 115.

⁴² Moreau, pp. 114-117; Rameau, p. 66; Cesinale, III, p. 676; Jeron, p. 290.

when he identifies the Capuchins with the Recollects. The views of the new missionaries as to their prospective mission are disclosed by one of their brothers. The Capuchin Ivo of Paris wrote on the eve of their embarkation: "Just at the time I write this, I bid farewell to several Capuchins who leave to go to Canada (i. e., Acadia), a barren desert where the inhabitants are as savage as the beasts and do not practise any religion."⁴³ At the beginning of August, 1632, the voyage came to an end, and the Capuchins landed in North America for the first time. On August 14, 1632, Razilly was in full and undisputed possession of the whole of Acadia. The Scotch left the country and the three or four Scotch families who remained at Port Royal were soon merged into the French families of the place. The French possessions extended at this time along the coast to Pemaquid Beach in Maine, and in the interior down to the Kennebec River.⁴⁴

Razilly and his Colonists established themselves at La Hève, a port on the southeastern shore of Nova Scotia. There they found a few French settlers dating from the time of the English occupation. La Hève became the residence of the Commander and the seat of the new government. Razilly portioned out the land among the colonists, giving each, as a rule, one hundred acres, and in one settlement near La Hève he had about forty colonists.⁴⁵ La Hève was the first place in Acadia where the Capuchins commenced their missionary labors among the French settlers, and it remained the principal colony in Acadia from 1632 to 1635.

A smaller colony existed near Port Royal. Champlain

⁴³ Ives de Paris O. Cap., *Les heureux succès de la piété*, Paris, 1632, p. 668 (quoted by Cesinale, III, p. 676, note 3; Jeron, p. 290).

⁴⁴ Moreau, pp. 117, 121; Rameau, p. 66; Dawson, p. 416; Richard, *Acadia*, New York, 1895, I, p. 29; Bourinot, p. 98.

⁴⁵ Moreau, pp. 130, 140-141; Rameau, pp. 66-67; Bourinot, p. 98.

had visited this beautiful basin in 1604 and had given it its name. In 1605, the French founded a settlement on the northern shore of the basin at Lower Granville, opposite Goat Island. This was the first permanent settlement by Europeans in North America. Burned and completely demolished in 1613 by the English, Port Royal was partly rebuilt by the remaining French settlers. In 1628, the Scotch took possession of Port Royal and retained it until Captain Forester surrendered it to Razilly in August, 1632.⁴⁶ A small settlement of Frenchmen existed for several years on the Upper Annapolis River, a short distance from Port Royal. These were the survivors of the original colony at Port Royal. In 1632, they were increased by a few Scotch families who had preferred to remain in Acadia.⁴⁷ A French garrison was located in Fort Pentagoet (Pentagouet), called Fort Penobscot by the English. Fort Pentagoet had been built by the French as a fortress probably as early as 1626 on the shore of the Castine peninsula, near the head of Penobscot Bay. It developed later into the present city of Castine in Maine. Fort Pentagoet (Penobscot) was finally called Fort Castine, and traces of it still remain. Razilly took possession of Fort Pentagoet in 1632, and it remained in the hands of the French until 1654, when Acadia was re-occupied by the English.⁴⁸ When Razilly came to Acadia he found another fort in the hands of some Frenchmen, with Latour as its Commandant. Charles Latour came to Acadia in 1610. After the destruction of Port Royal in 1613, he became a wood-ranger, one of a notoriously low class who lived as hunters and trappers among the Indians. Latour's immoral con-

⁴⁶ Dawson, pp. 241-249; Parkman, *Pioneers*, pp. 223-295; Moreau, pp. 27-100; Rameau, pp. 1-58; Rochemonteix, I, pp. 14-84.

⁴⁷ Rameau, pp. 66, 70; Bourinot, p. 98.

⁴⁸ Moreau, pp. 121-122, 131-133; Smith, in Winsor, IV, pp. 146-147, 161; *Collection*, I, pp. 12, 14, 16; Bourinot, pp. 94, 98.

duct during that time is abundantly proved; he became the leader of a gang of about twenty adventurers like himself, and some time before 1630 he built Fort Lomeron whose name he changed (probably in 1631 or 1632) to Fort Latour. It was situated either at Cape Fourchu or at Cape Sable in Nova Scotia. The King of France confirmed this small possession on February 11, 1631. The French wood-rangers had been too much habituated to the adventurous life of hunters and trappers to take kindly to the sedentary life of toilsome colonists. Only a few joined the newcomers, and most of them preferred to stay with their chief Latour.⁴⁹

These were all the French settlements in Acadia in 1632. Razilly sent some Capuchins to Fort Latour expecting that they would induce its Commandant to lead a Christian life. Latour received them without complaint, but refused to change his mode of living. He feigned submission to Razilly, but at the same time attempted to set up a rival power in Acadia. In November, 1632, Latour sailed for France, and on March 6, 1633, he published a proclamation at La Rochelle stating that he would offer some of his land in Acadia to prospective colonists. He mentions in this proclamation that Capuchins had charge of the divine service at Fort Latour. To all appearances he did not meet with much success in this project. A few days later, he embarked for Acadia with some colonists who were accompanied by secular priests and religious. They had hardly set sail, however, when De Bouthillier, the Secretary of State, acting on the instructions of Père Joseph, despatched an explicit order to Latour "to send away from Fort Latour both Secular and Regular Priests staying there, to convey them back to France and to reinstate the Capuchins

⁴⁹ Moreau, pp. 100-108, 123-134; Rameau, pp. 30, 53-62, 66, 71-73; Richard, *Acadia*, I, pp. 29, 35; Dawson, p. 415; Bourinot, pp. 93-97.

in their place (March 16, 1633).” How far Latour complied with this injunction is uncertain. At all events the Capuchins had remained at Fort Latour in the latter part of 1633, when we hear of their bad treatment by Latour. In 1640, the Capuchins left the Fort for a time, scandalized by Latour’s life and wearied with the bad treatment meted out to them. Their mission to convert this chief of what was in reality a gang of ruffians had failed. It was impossible for them to remain any longer in the place after learning that Latour had attempted to instigate Indian revolts against Razilly in the latter part of 1633. We find, nevertheless, in 1635, a Recollect Father at Fort Latour. The *Company of One Hundred Associates* had delayed for five years to convey Recollects on their ships to Canada, so that they were practically debarred from that mission.⁵⁰ Meanwhile they had entered Acadia. They landed in Acadia in 1633, only to be recalled immediately by De Bouthillier. In 1635, a Recollect was stationed at Fort Latour where he had cultivated half an acre of land, portioned out into an orchard, vegetable garden, and wheat land. Subsequently we meet with Recollects remaining with Latour during the time of his rebellion against the lawful authority of Razilly until January 28, 1645.⁵¹

Razilly established his colony on the right basis. Contrary to the Spanish way of exploiting the mineral resources, his object was the cultivation of the virgin country. His only desire was to people Acadia with colonists, and year by year he brought as many settlers from France as he could induce to make the journey. It is a mistake of Richard ⁵² to define Razilly’s object as trade rather than colonization, for he was convinced that every aspect of colo-

⁵⁰ Rochemonteix, I, p. 187, note 2.

⁵¹ Moreau, pp. 130-134, 139, 158; Rameau, pp. 72-73.

⁵² *Acadia*, I, p. 30.

nization must be made subservient to the principles of religion. He realized the advantages the Catholic Church would derive from his colony in these northern regions. He planned a project whose consequences would have been of the greatest importance, if it could have been realized. Razilly, we know, was one of the highest dignitaries of the Order of Malta, and he thought of founding a Priory of the Knights of St. John in Acadia. He wrote in this sense to the Grand Master of the Order of Malta on September 8, 1635. The letter has unfortunately perished. It would be a very precious document for the history of his government in Acadia. We have lost in it an authentic account of his plans and projects and a list of all the French posts at that time. In his answer to Razilly,⁵³ dated Malta, February 20, 1636, the Grand Master praises his zeal but declines his proposal of founding a Priory, because such an enterprise would necessitate too great an expense of money to the Order.⁵⁴

Razilly was dead when the Grand Master drafted this letter,⁵⁵ and his untimely death prevented him from accomplishing all the noble projects he had had in view. What he had gained during the first two years of his administration, he set forth in a *Memoir* under date of July 15, 1634. In reading this report one cannot fail to notice the Catholic spirit which always directed him in his work of colonization. The prime question was always the interests of religion and the salvation of souls. This also explains why the *Memoir* was sent to Père Joseph, who had been acting as the political protector of the enterprise. Père Joseph

⁵³ This letter is printed in *Collection*, I, p. 114.

⁵⁴ Moreau, pp. 140, 143-144; Rameau, pp. 74-75.

⁵⁵ He had died in November, 1635, and not in 1636, as Dawson (*op. cit.*, p. 416), Richard (*op. cit.*, p. 30), Rameau (p. 75), and Campbell (*Acadia*, in *Cath. Encycl.*, I, p. 91) erroneously assert. Cf. Moreau, pp. 144 and 164; *Collection*, II, p. 354; Bourinot, p. 99.

was to give the *Memoir* to Richelieu and to use his influence to raise the necessary financial help. Razilly and his friends had spent up to that time 50,000 crowns, and they were in need of assistance. To obtain funds he wrote this *Memoir*, and in it Razilly asked for a subvention of fifty to sixty thousand crowns. He had received nothing from the Royal Exchequer, but Richelieu himself came to his assistance.

A new company was started. All connection with the *Company of One Hundred Associates* was severed, and the *Company of New France* was constituted as a private concern. Its members were Razilly, his brother Claude Razilly, and Jean Condonnier. Richelieu contributed seventeen thousand livres out of his personal funds and became (January 16, 1635) proprietor of the fifth part of the possessions of the *Company of New France*. Richelieu's fifth part was later spent entirely in the interests of the Missions. The new *Company* was endowed with all royal prerogatives, and Razilly was promoted to the dignity of Governor Lieutenant-General of Acadia. On January 25, 1635, two new associate members were added. The *Company of New France*, consisting of six members, was then established. Razilly had again sufficient means to carry on his work, but death cut short his career a few months later.⁵⁶ Razilly was a noble son of the Church and of the State. He commences his *Memoir* with these words: "I have no other end in view than the glory of God, the grandeur of the King, and the particular service of Your Eminence."⁵⁷ In the galaxy of New France pioneers he surely does not deserve the last place. Unfortunately his memory is overshadowed by the unhappy fate of his colony in later years.

⁵⁶ Moreau, pp. 134-139; Shea, *Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, New York, 1886, p. 236.

⁵⁷ Moreau, p. 134.

Very little is known about the missionary labors of the Capuchins during Razilly's administration. On July 19, 1632, the Capuchins sent a *Relation* of their work to Propaganda, which is extant in the *Archivio di Prop. Fide*, Atti. vol. VIII, no. 6, f. 269.⁵⁸ The short summary given in the *Acta S. Congr. Prop. Fide* states that "The Capuchins were inhabiting two houses or hospices, one at Port Royal, and one at La Hève (Portus S. Mariae). From La Hève they could easily go into Virginia to repress the progress of the English heretics." From Port Royal and La Hève, missionaries went to other places. We know that a Capuchin had been stationed in 1632 and 1633 at Fort Latour. A French garrison was stationed from 1632 to 1654 at Pentagoet,⁵⁹ and the Capuchins resided there to minister to the soldiers. Pentagoet, or Castine, had been the first place within the United States where the Capuchins established a permanent residence.⁶⁰

The Capuchins were very successful in their work among the French settlers. Unfortunately, we do not possess as lengthy *Relations* about their Missions as do the Jesuits. All our information is contained in a short reference to them in Razilly's *Memoir*; but even this meagre notice bespeaks the highest efficiency of the missionaries. "The

⁵⁸ Quoted by Cesinale, III, p. 677, note 4; cf. Jeron, p. 294 (who erroneously identifies Portus S. Mariae with Pentagoet); cf. *Atti Archivio di Prop. Fide*, vol. VIII, no. 5, f. 66 (3 May, 1632) on the progress in Canada and the three missions of the French there.

⁵⁹ Moreau, pp. 133, 139.

⁶⁰ Cesinale (*op. cit.*, III, p. 680) states that the Capuchins first passed over from Nova Scotia to Maine in 1642. But this is a mistake. He did not know that the Capuchins had acted as military chaplains in Maine since 1632. Besides, the Capuchins ministered to the floating population of French fishermen and traders who visited the Acadian coasts during the summer months. In the list of those transitory mission-posts mentioned later we may find some places which were attended by the Capuchins during this first period of their missionary activity.

Capuchins," writes Razilly, "have guided us so well by their examples, that by the grace of God, vice is not found in our settlement, and since I have been here, I have found no cause for punishment: unconstrained charity and harmony prevail here."⁶¹ No higher tribute could be paid to the Capuchins, when we reflect that only two years had passed since they had commenced their missionary labors in America. Within this short time they had formed people of different classes and tastes, brought together by chance from most diverse environments, into a model community. Unfortunately Razilly's encomium is the only information we possess about the activity of the Capuchins from 1632 to 1639.

The missionaries in New France could convert the Indians all the easier, because the French and Indians had always lived on friendly terms. "The history of the Acadians," writes Rameau,⁶² "presents this distinction that the happy harmony between them and the Micmac Indians was never disturbed, and during a hundred and fifty years we do not come across one instance of a shot being fired or of a quarrel between them and their savage friends." A descendant of the Acadians has recently made the same observation: "It is remarkable," writes Richard,⁶³ "that the French never had to fight the Indians of the countries they occupied, nay, that they made them their faithful allies even in the most critical junctures." Razilly corroborates this in his *Memoir* of 1634: "They submit willingly to all the laws, both divine and human, one may impose upon

⁶¹ "Lesquels par leur exemples nous ont si bien conduits que par la grâce de Dieu le vice ne règne point en cette habitation; et depuis que j'y suis, je n'ai pas trouvé lieu de châtement: la charité et l'amitié y sont sans contrainte," quoted by Moreau, pp. 134-135; Jeron, p. 293; Candide, *Port Royal*, p. 334.

⁶² *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

⁶³ *Acadia*, I, p. 64.

them.”⁶⁴ The Capuchins did not confine their labors to the care of their countrymen, but worked also for the conversion of the Indians. The few Catholic Indians remaining from the Jesuit-Recollect Mission first claimed their attentive care. We have, however, no details about their Indian Mission before 1639.

Razilly died in 1635. His successor, D'Aunay,—Charles de Menou, Seigneur d'Aunay (or Aulnay) de Charnizay,—a relative of Razilly, came to Acadia in 1632. He had been the right hand of Razilly, and had acted as his lieutenant during his administration. D'Aunay's first act of government was to transfer the seat of government to Port Royal, and the majority of the settlers went along with him, a small number continuing to live at La Hève. D'Aunay established his colony at Port Royal on the very site now occupied by the city of Annapolis. When Latour refused to obey D'Aunay, hostilities began between the two leaders which paralyzed the development of the colony for a long time. In 1638, D'Aunay and Latour were both named Lieutenant-Governors, and Acadia was divided between them. This did not settle the dispute, and two years later open warfare broke out between the two factions. On February 28, 1641, Latour's commission was annulled and D'Aunay was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of all Acadia. Latour subsequently made efforts to enlist the English of Massachusetts in his quarrel. In September, 1641, he was busy negotiating a treaty with Boston. Not succeeding in this, he visited Boston in 1643, and made a second visit the following year for the same purpose. On both occasions he was unable to secure the direct co-operation of Massachusetts. On April 17, 1645, D'Aunay took Latour's Fort Saint-Jean by storm, concluded a treaty of peace with

⁶⁴ “Ils se soumettent de leur franche volonté à toutes les lois qu'on veut leur imposer, soit divines, soit humaines,” quoted by Moreau, p. 135; Jeron, p. 293; Candide, *Port Royal*, p. 334.

Boston on September 28, 1646, and was acknowledged as undisputed master in Acadia.⁶⁵

These prolonged hostilities between D'Aunay and Latour retarded the progress of the colony and proved a great obstacle to the missionary work of the Capuchins: The sentence passed by the French court on Latour, February 21, 1642, emphasizes the fact that "Latour by his misdeeds and his bad behavior handicapped the progress and the advancement of the Christian religion among the savages."⁶⁶ In October, 1643, D'Aunay complained bitterly about the harm done by Latour to the growth of the colonies and to the conversion of the savages. If all the time, money, and energy wasted in this warfare had been spent in developing the country, Acadia probably would have gained that rank in population and cultivation which it reached thirty years later.⁶⁷ In spite of these internal contests and discords, "the incessant interference and invasions which the English at Boston carried on, must be considered as the chief cause of retarding the progress of the French settlement in Acadia."⁶⁸ This verdict of the historian of Nova Scotia is fully borne out by the facts. In an attestation drawn up at Port Royal (October 20, 1643), the Capuchin missionaries state that the English under Latour had attacked Port Royal on August 6, 1643, killed and burned two soldiers so badly that they were unrecognizable, wounded others and otherwise caused much damage to the buildings and cattle. They attest, moreover, that the English sold every Frenchman they caught as slaves, an infamous traffic which would be the ruin of the colonies

⁶⁵ Moreau, pp. 119-122, 144-239; Rameau, pp. 68-70, 74-76, 89-93; Richard, I, p. 30; Winsor, IV, pp. 144-145; Dawson, p. 416; *Collection*, I, pp. 115-117; Bourinot, pp. 99-104.

⁶⁶ Moreau, pp. 166-167, 191.

⁶⁷ Rameau, p. 93.

⁶⁸ Murdoch, I, p. 177, quoted by Winsor, IV, p. 142, note 1.

in Acadia and would frustrate the conversion of the savages. They complained that the English had been harassing the French for seven years and the excessive expenses involved in repelling their attacks had brought the French colony to the brink of ruin.⁶⁹ Peace reigned in Acadia from 1645 to 1650. An era of prosperity set in, but there was to be no permanent peace or rest for the Acadians. D'Aunay died on May 24, 1650, and his flourishing establishments became again the stage of great disorder. Acadia fell a prey to the usurpations of adventurers. Madame D'Aunay was thrown upon her own resources after her husband's death. She could not ward off her many foes, and faced utter ruin. To save at least a part of the inheritance of her husband, she married Latour on February 24, 1653, "to secure the peace and tranquillity of the country", as the marriage contract read. For some months tranquillity was restored, and then one of D'Aunay's French creditors, named Le Borgne, came to Acadia at the head of a large force and occupied Port Royal. The next year he took possession of other places and was preparing to attack Latour when the English appeared on the scene of action and in a few days all Acadia was once more in the hands of the English. Acadia remained in possession of England from 1654 until 1667, when it was again restored to France by the Treaty of Breda.⁷⁰

The conditions under which the Capuchins labored in Acadia were not propitious ones. The evils of the situation were aggravated by the rivalry of the Recollects, who had been recalled from Acadia in 1633. Nevertheless, we find in 1635 a Recollect stationed at Fort Latour. The Capuchins had quitted the place because they could no

⁶⁹ This attestation of Oct. 20, 1643, is printed in *Collection*, I, pp. 117-118, quoted by Moreau, pp. 189-190.

⁷⁰ Moreau, pp. 253-265; Rameau, pp. 106-110; Bourinot, pp. 106-109; Smith, in Winsor, IV, pp. 145-146.

longer carry on their work successfully among the ribald followers of the adventurer Latour. The latter was in possession (1635) of a second fort, Fort St. Louis, in the neighborhood of Fort Latour at Cape Sable. In 1636 or 1637, he built Fort St. Jean on a place called Jemsek on St. John River. This fort was erected where the city of St. John, New Brunswick, now stands, probably at Portland Point, on the east side of the harbor. Some time after, Latour abandoned the forts at Cape Sable to reside in this fort at the mouth of St. John River. The Recollects followed him from Cape Sable to Fort St. John. There they remained, even when Latour had proved contumacious and refused to obey the royal commands of February 21, 1642, and March 6, 1644. They continued to associate with Latour though the latter had been twice judicially declared a rebel and traitor, and they drew up two attestations (April 24, 1642 and January 20, 1644) in favor of Latour. They even filed a claim against D'Aunay (February, 1644) that "he should be sentenced by the French Court to pay for the damages caused them by the latter's violences of all kind". In 1643, Latour had received a ship carrying provisions and colonists for his establishment. There were a hundred and forty persons, all Huguenots. From the year 1627 no Huguenots were allowed to enter New France. D'Aunay was besieging Latour at this time, and in May, 1643, Latour, his wife, and the two Recollects stole out of Fort St. John and boarded the ship. It must have been an awkward position for the two friars to find themselves among French Huguenots. They sailed to Massachusetts, landing somewhere in the neighborhood of Boston. Latour went there to ask help from the Puritans, and the Capuchins state in their attestation of October 20, 1643, that Latour had attended Puritan services while at Boston and that he had allowed the Huguenots to keep religious service on his ship in pres-

ence of one Recollect Father.⁷¹ At the end of a month Latour returned to Acadia well supplied with provisions and ammunition. His five ships were manned by a hundred and forty Rochelle Huguenots and eighty Puritans. Latour had married a French woman in 1640, and the marriage ceremony was performed by the Recollects at Fort St. John. While staying at Boston, Latour's wife became a Protestant (1644), and after her return to Fort St. John, in 1645, she used all her influence to convert both her husband and his men to Puritanism. The Recollects were sorely disappointed at her apostasy, and on January 28, 1645, they decided to leave the Fort. They had been the unwilling witnesses of blasphemies against their religion, and owing to repeated offences against their calling, they decided to remain no longer in the fort. Father Andrew Ronsaud, the Superior, inflicted ecclesiastical censure on Latour and his wife, and with eight or nine soldiers who refused to serve the excommunicated Latour any longer, the two Recollects left Fort Saint John. They went to Port Royal where they were cordially received, and were lodged with the Capuchin Fathers. The soldiers entered the service of D'Aunay. This ended the Recollect mission in Fort St. John.⁷²

D'Aunay captured Fort St. John April 17, 1645. Latour was ruined. Romance has clustered about this event. What the American historians relate about the courageous Madame Latour fighting as bravely as any knight, and about the cruel and relentless D'Aunay is fiction. Latour's wife was held captive by the victorious D'Aunay at Fort St. John, where three weeks later she died. Shortly

⁷¹ *Collection*, I, p. 118.

⁷² Moreau, pp. 130-134, 139, 156, 158, 174 sq., 193, 195, 201, 206, 211-212; Rameau, p. 72 sq.; Bourinot, p. 99; Smith, in Winsor, IV, p. 145; Candide O. M. Cap., *À Propos d'une Légende*, p. 331; Shea, *Church in Colonial Days*, p. 236, note 3.

before her death she was converted by the Capuchins, and abjured publicly her errors in the chapel of the Fort. She was buried at Fort St. John with all the honors due, though not to the nobility of her family, at least to the rank she had occupied in New France.⁷³ This quondam Puritan has ever been the subject of highest admiration from American historians. "All the acts of her adventurous and tragic career," writes Bourinot,⁷⁴ "may well be an inspiring theme for poetry and romance," and with high-sounding praise Smith says:⁷⁵ "Acadia had produced no men of marked character. Madame Latour alone exhibits the courage and energy naturally to be looked for under the circumstances in which three generations of settlers were placed."

During the period of hostilities between D'Aunay and Latour the Capuchins had labored in the interests of peace. The very opening of these hostilities is marked by a striking instance of their efforts. D'Aunay, accompanied by two Capuchin Fathers, led an expedition in 1640 from Port Royal to succor Fort Pentaguet against the impending attack by the English of Massachusetts Bay. Quite unexpectedly he was treacherously assaulted by Latour, and in spite of his inferior force, he came off victorious, taking both Latour and his wife captive. At the request of the Capuchins, D'Aunay set his prisoners at liberty, an act of generosity which was ill requited by these recipients of clemency. This happened shortly before July 14, 1640.⁷⁶ Bourinot remarks⁷⁷ that "the Capuchin friars had always a good word to say for Latour". But this distinguished

⁷³ Moreau, pp. 225-226; Candide, *à Propos d'une Légende*, pp. 325-332.

⁷⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁷⁵ In Winsor, IV, p. 149.

⁷⁶ Moreau, pp. 158-160; Shea, *Church in Colonial Days*, p. 243, note 1; Candide, *Légende*, p. 327.

⁷⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 99.

author is obviously mistaken. His statement applies to the Recollects, the friends of Latour until 1645, and not to the Capuchins. The latter entertained different sentiments. In their attestation of October 20, 1643, the Capuchins style Latour "a bad Frenchman and much worse than the English heretics on account of the scandalous and heretical life which both he and his men lead".⁷⁸ D'Aunay was in possession of four forts in 1645: Port Royal, Pentagoet, St. John, and a fourth which was either at La Hève, Miscou, or Sainte-Anne. In 1650, from forty-five to fifty French families were living at Fort Royal and La Hève, and besides these there were about sixty men employed as soldiers, forest-rangers, or servants. Up to 1643, D'Aunay always had two hundred inhabitants residing in his three settlements. From 1643 to his death in 1650, he usually had living in his four forts three hundred people. D'Aunay informs us that in 1643 he had four hundred mouths to feed. In this number are included the Capuchins and their Indian pupils. But these were not all the Catholic Frenchmen toiling in Acadia, for beyond the confines of D'Aunay's domains Nicholas Denys had established a colony at Chedabucto, near Cape Canso, situated on Cape Breton Island, called St. Pierre. This was more a trading post than an agricultural colony. A few smaller posts were connected with this principal establishment. About seventy to eighty Frenchmen were living in Denys' settlements. Acadia, therefore, had been from 1643 to 1654 the permanent home of about five hundred Frenchmen. This number had fallen off during the time of the subsequent English occupation. The census of 1671 shows the population to be about four hundred souls.⁷⁹ There must have been

⁷⁸ *Collection*, I, p. 118.

⁷⁹ Moreau, pp. 248-249, 261, 263; Rameau, pp. 73, 97; Richard, *Acadia*, I, p. 31.

in various places many other settlements not included in these statistics, made up of half-breeds living along the rivers and sea-coast, who had intermarried with the Indians and had adopted their mode of life. When Razilly occupied Acadia in 1632 he found about twenty-five to thirty Frenchmen living there, almost wholly estranged from civilized life.⁸⁰ Besides these permanent settlers a floating population of Frenchmen "of small proportion in winter, but swelling in summer to thousands, as it is the case to this day at Saint Pierre and Miquelon",⁸¹ had to be taken care of by the Capuchins. The Capuchin missionary, Ignatius of Paris, wrote in 1656 about these periodical visitors to the Acadian coasts: "All the harbors of this region, particularly from Cape Sable, . . . are occupied for six whole months by French fishermen who leave France in their ships at the commencement of the spring in order to devote themselves continuously to cod-fishing on the coast of that district. At the close of the fishing season they return to France with their cargoes, usually about the end of September or October".⁸² These fishermen had been carrying on their trade in 1656 for more than half a century. Some of them had contracted more or less regular matrimonial unions with Indian women or half-breeds.⁸³ "Of the extent of their labors," Shea justly remarks.⁸⁴ "there is no doubt. The Capuchins . . . sent missionaries who attended the French along the coast from Chaleurs Bay to the Kennebec. . . . The centre of the mission was at Port Royal, but there were stations attended by the Capuchins as far east as the Kennebec." We are rather

⁸⁰ Rameau, pp. 73-74, 97; Richard, I, p. 31.

⁸¹ Shea, *Church in Colonial Days*, p. 236.

⁸² *Brevis ac dilucida relatio*, in "Report concerning Canadian Archives", Ottawa, 1905, pp. 333, 337.

⁸³ Rameau, p. 74.

⁸⁴ *Church in Colonial Days*, pp. 236, 237.

well informed about these different mission-posts in the *Relation* of Father Ignatius of Paris. It was written in 1656 as a report to Propaganda and is our most valuable document about the Acadian Mission. The original is preserved in the Archives of Propaganda (*Scritture Antiche*, vol. 260, ff. 16-20). The first edition of the Latin text was published in: *The Report concerning Canadian Archives for the Year 1904*. (Ottawa, 1905, Appendix H., pp. 333-337, accompanied by an English translation, pp. 337-341).⁸⁵ In 1654 the Capuchins attended the following stations: Port Royal, Fort St. John, and Fort Pentagoet or Fort St. Peter. These were the three principal mission-posts. Three missionaries were also stationed in another Fort St. Peter, a little settlement at Cape Canso in Nova Scotia. This place was perhaps Nicholas Denys' settlement. A Capuchin, moreover, resided at Nepigiquit, a place situated on Chaleurs Bay in New Brunswick.⁸⁶

Besides these five permanent residences, Father Ignatius mentions some suitable places for establishing Guilds of French Merchants during the time of the English occupation. These places must have been in posts visited by the French fishermen and traders from the beginning of the colony. They had been the temporary mission-posts of the Capuchins during the summer months. Father Ignatius names Cape Sable, Port La Hève or Port Philoment, Port Paspebiak, Port St. Louis, Port Archibucto, Port Miramichi, Port Miscou or Cibigan.⁸⁷ To these must be added Sainte-Anne, on Cape Breton Island. We know that D'Aunay had small colonies at La Hève, on Miscou Island at the entrance of Chaleurs Bay, and at Sainte-Anne on Cape Breton Island in 1645. In one of these three places

⁸⁵ *Candide, Silhouettes*, p. 322, note 3.

⁸⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 335, 339.

⁸⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 333-334, 337-338.

he had built a fort in that year.⁸⁸ Chebucto, now Halifax, and Ste. Croix Bay were at that time frequented ports and possessed churches in charge of the Capuchins.⁸⁹ This list of temporary mission-posts attended by the Capuchins remains incomplete. We have to add, moreover, the posts among the Indians in the interior of the country. I append here a table of the permanent stations with the time of their duration:

Port Royal, now Annapolis, Nova Scotia, 1632-1654.

Fort Pentagoet, now Castine, Maine, 1632-1654.

Fort St. John, now St. John, New Brunswick, 1645-1654.

La Hève, Nova Scotia, 1632 till about 1640.

Fort Latour, Nova Scotia, 1632 to 1633, perhaps to 1634.

Fort St. Peter, Nova Scotia, 1645 or 1646, if not earlier, to 1655.

Nepigiquit, New Brunswick, 1648, or earlier, till 1654.⁹⁰

About forty families lived as peaceful tillers of the soil in 1650, scattered over the valley of Port Royal. A few families were settled on farms at La Hève. Several of these families were remnants of the colony of Poutrincourt (1610-1613). The majority, however, had been transported there by Razilly and D'Aunay. These colonists cultivated farms of about one hundred acres each, and had but a small rent to pay. This colonial establishment was a faithful reproduction of the feudal *seigneurie* of Old France. The Governor of Acadia possessed besides his seigniorial tenure two large farms, two flour-mills and a saw-mill. D'Aunay worked on his farms like the least of his tenants. He always led the life of an exemplary Catholic.⁹¹ The Capuchin Father Ignatius of Paris renders the

⁸⁸ Moreau, p. 248.

⁸⁹ Cf. Rameau, pp. 74, 96.

⁹⁰ According to the Relation of Father Ignatius of Paris.

⁹¹ Rameau, pp. 80-85; Candide, *Port-Royal*, pp. 330-331.

highest praises to this much maligned, though sterling, Governor of Acadia. His letter, dated Senlis, August 6, 1653, will always remain in justification of the valiant *Sieur D'Aunay*.⁹² "During the last six or seven months of his life," he writes, "D'Aunay went to confession every other day, sometimes every day. In his last confession two days before his death, I hardly found matter for absolution. He kept faithfully all the fasts prescribed by the Church. He assisted at Mass every morning and at devotion every evening. When in church, he kept always a reverential attitude, kneeling most of the time. I cannot tell the thousandth part I have seen of all his good qualities. His charity towards the poor savages, his servants and tenants was exemplary. He was entirely changed from what he had been before. Quite often he was much reduced in circumstances. Three days before his death, I saw him return home drenched with rain and covered with mud to the waist. He had just put up some fences and had re-surveyed the farms. This is in a few words what my conscience obliges me to say to all who will see and hear, to justify the *Sieur D'Aunay* who was calumniated so much after his death."

The houses of those colonists in Acadia were at first very unshapely structures. A goodly number were log-houses. Some rested on big poles, interlaced with branches and plastered with mud. The better class of dwellings and D'Aunay's manor-house were built of pieces of beams piled one upon another and fastened at their extremities. The houses were covered with reeds or bark, sometimes with shingles. The furniture and the utensils, mostly of wood, were rough products of the carpenter's trade. In a few years these tenants began to prosper, and the primitive

⁹² It is published in *Collection de Manuscrits*, I, Quebec, 1883, pp. 136-139. Quotations in *Candide*, *Port-Royal*, pp. 331, 332, 338; Moreau, pp. 246-247.

huts then disappeared. The church was a frame building, large and strong, but very simple.⁹³ In these plain houses of Port Royal a happy family lived. In that homely church a staunchly Catholic population prayed in 1650. The grandfathers and grandmothers of the famous Acadians of 1755 knelt there in reverent meditation. There the *Trahan*, the *Gaudet*, *Doucet*, *Dugast*, *Boudrot*, *Bourgeois*, *Landry*, *Peseley*, *Lejeune*, *Joffriau*, *Daigle*, *Terriau*, *Gautherot*, *Thibaudeau*, *Leblanc* and so many others, who subsequently became heads of exceedingly numerous clans, attended Mass. There the fundamental stock of the Acadian people assembled. After 1654, a very limited number of colonists cast in their lot with these hardy tenants of D'Aunay. But their posterity was greatly outnumbered by the descendants of Razilly's and D'Aunay's colonists. These newcomers and their children caught the ardor of the faith of those old settlers of 1650.⁹⁴ They were then accustomed to see strolling through Port Royal's streets a Reverend Father, the parish priest, Father Ignatius of Paris. A *Father Felician* he was, though different in name, and in the shape of his cowl and sandals, yet in spirit the same Franciscan friar. He and his brothers had first moulded the people Longfellow's pen has since immortalized in his idyllic *Evangeline*. All the happy scenes painted by the New England poet were passed in Acadia under the guiding hand of the Capuchin Friars. In the little church at Port Royal the Micmac and Abenaki Indians mingled freely in 1650 with their pale-faced brothers. A mutual faith had made them trusted friends. In the schools at Port Royal the copper-colored boys and girls were taught the rudiments of education. The conversion of the savages was the work the Capuchins had chiefly at heart.

⁹³ Rameau, pp. 81-82, 97-98.

⁹⁴ Rameau, pp. 67, 84-88, 90, 98.

They strove constantly to convert the natives, and in order to facilitate their conversion Richelieu had inserted in 1627 a clause in the articles of the *Company of One Hundred Associates*, whereby every converted Indian had to be considered a French citizen, even in France.⁹⁵ Father Roche-monteix states⁹⁶ that the project of the great Cardinal produced very meagre results, and that the Jesuit plan of establishing separate Indian villages was more practical and fruitful. But the Capuchins in Acadia adhered to Richelieu's system. Like so many others Richelieu fancied that the Indians could be converted more readily by educating their children in a *Seminary* or boarding-school. These trained *Seminarians* could then carry the light of faith to their tribes and could serve as the teachers of coming Christian generations. For this reason these institutions were called *Seminaries*.

After 1633, the Jesuits in Canada gathered the Indian children of the villages into their houses to teach them the rudiments of faith. At last the planned Indian seminary was realized in Canada. In 1635, the Jesuits established a school at Quebec for Indian boys. In July, 1635, six Huron boys entered the precincts of this novel institution. Two years later the two most promising boys died and one quitted the school. The newcomers who took their places ran away in the spring of 1638. The next year new recruits presented themselves: Montagnais, Algonquins and Hurons. However, not long after, the *pensionnat* had to be closed for lack of scholars. The Indian *seminary* at Quebec lasted five years (1635-1640). Father Vimont wrote in 1643: "The *seminary* of Indian boys was discontinued principally because no obvious fruits showed themselves among the savages by commencing their conversion

⁹⁵ Art. 19, in *Collection*, I, p. 70.

⁹⁶ *Les Jesuits et la Nouvelle-France*, I, pp. 279-280.

through the instruction of the children." The failure of the Indian *seminary* was looked upon as a victory by those who opposed the Jesuit system of education. Later on, after Mgr. Laval had come to Quebec, a second Indian *seminary* was established there in 1668. To hasten the work of education, Laval put several little French boys on the benches with the Indians. The six Huron boys left one by one. Five years later, only one Indian boy remained and the *seminary* was closed. The Sulpitians at Montreal opened a similar Indian *seminary* in 1688. In a few years the French king complained that they did not apply themselves to this work any more.⁹⁷ Father Rochemonteix remarks: ⁹⁸ "They (the Sulpitians) did not succeed because success was impossible."

Success attended the efforts of the Capuchins. Richelieu and Père Joseph had instructed them to begin immediately the work of educating the Indian children. The order was obeyed, and as soon as circumstances permitted, the Indian college was opened. Unfortunately we have, as we remarked above, very little information about their Indian missions before 1635. We are better informed about these missions during the succeeding period of their ministration. The Capuchins established their first Indian School at La Hève, and called it, according to the custom of the times, a *Seminary*. The exact date of the foundation is not known. The Rev. D. McPherson makes it contemporary with the Jesuit Huron college at Quebec. "About 1635," he writes,⁹⁹ "the Capuchins opened their college at Port Royal." Father Candide favors a somewhat later date. "It

⁹⁷ Rochemonteix, I, pp. 279-291; Campbell, *Pioneer Priests*, III, pp. 23-25; Parkman, *Jesuits in North America*, pp. 167-168 (14th ed., Boston, 1880).

⁹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 291; Ristigouche, 1910, p. 59.

⁹⁹ In *Souvenir d'un III Centenaire en Pays Micmac*.

seems to me," he says,¹⁰⁰ "that the construction of the *seminary* at Port Royal must be placed after Razilly's death (1635). It was certainly started before 1635, and, consequently, preceded the Quebec seminary, the fruit of the same thought, of the same devotedness, and of the same apostolic spirit." Very probably it was begun about 1633 in La Hève, and in 1636 transferred to Port Royal. This was the first High School within the limits of New France.¹⁰¹ D'Aunay informs us in his *Memoir* that in 1643 the Capuchins were instructing thirty baptized Indian children in their *seminaries*. These were Micmacs and Abenakis. Besides these thirty inmates, the Capuchins were instructing a number of externs, both French and Indians.¹⁰² This was a success which neither the Jesuits nor the Sulpitians had accomplished. The Capuchins had solved the problem in which Laval had failed; they had put little French boys on the benches with the savages. This peaceful work was carried on in spite of the difficulties occasioned by the struggle between their friend D'Aunay and Latour. In their attestation of October 20, 1643, the Capuchins point out the sad fact that Latour was then "impeding the conversion of the savages and this very year we would have been compelled to send back to the woods those savages we had already baptized, if Sieur D'Aunay had not made a gallant effort to save the seminary." They feared, however, that the school might have to be closed on account of lack of funds.¹⁰³ This was averted and the *Seminary* continued to flourish. In 1647 D'Aunay reported to the king the admirable results of the Indian schools and of the

¹⁰⁰ *Port-Royal*, p. 334.

¹⁰¹ Morice, in *Cath. Encyl.*, vol. X, p. 284, s. v. Micmacs.

¹⁰² Moreau, pp. 248-249; Rameau, p. 88; Candide, *Port-Royal*, p. 334; Shea, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

¹⁰³ Text in *Collection*, I, pp. 117-118; quoted in Moreau, p. 190, and Candide, *op. cit.*, p. 336.

entire mission. The *Lettres Patentes* of King Louis to D'Aunay, dated February, 1647, speaks highly of his establishment of the Capuchin schools and missions.¹⁰⁴ The King says: "I am well informed that the Sieur D'Aunay has erected a *Seminary* conducted by a good number of Capuchins, for the instruction of the savage children, . . . and that the whole colony, the Religious, and the *seminaries* are supported by him and subsist on his own costs and expenses without other persons contributing anything." The King encourages D'Aunay at the same time to carry on the noble work "of taking care that these savages be instructed in the belief of the true God and in the Christian faith and religion."¹⁰⁵ The two great intents of all French discoveries, remarks Moreau,¹⁰⁶ "were always the conversion of savages and the establishment of Catholic colonies". Father Ignatius of Paris in 1653 gives a graphic description of the Capuchins marching with their thirty Indian "pensionnaires" and their day-scholars to the church at Port Royal. This was a sight to be witnessed every Sunday at the Capital of Acadia, so long as D'Aunay was Governor of the happy Acadians.¹⁰⁷ He had stipulated, as Rameau states,¹⁰⁸ that the Capuchins were to educate as a rule thirty Micmac or Abenaki children in their *seminary*, not counting the externs. In 1645, an Indian was taken to France and was baptized in Paris. The Queen herself gave him the name of her son. He was sent back later to Acadia to assist in the conversion of his people both by his exemplary life and his instructions, for he was well instructed in the Christian faith. He was no doubt a pupil of the Port Royal

¹⁰⁴ Text in *Collection*, I, pp. 120-124.

¹⁰⁵ *Collection*, I, pp. 121-123; Moreau, pp. 243-244; Shea, p. 240, note 2; Jeron, p. 295.

¹⁰⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 245.

¹⁰⁷ Rameau, p. 100; *Candide, Port-Royal*, p. 337.

¹⁰⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 88-89.

seminary.¹⁰⁹ The Indian *seminary* was still in existence in 1654, in which latter year the English heretics took possession of Port Royal and banished the two pious Brothers John of Troyes and Francis Mary of Paris, who were residing at Port Royal to assist the Missionaries and the *Seminary* for Abenaki converts or catechumens.¹¹⁰ The Capuchin *seminary* at Port Royal had continued to exist for at least twenty years, from 1633 to 1654. Port Royal divides with Quebec and Harvard the honor of being the first in the educational field in North America. The Capuchin *seminary* presents this unique feature, Richelieu's ideal was realized, and white and red pupils were seated as brothers on the same benches. The Jesuits had opened at Quebec (1635) two separate colleges, one for French and one for Indian boys.¹¹¹ At Harvard (1636) no Indian was admitted. Parkman accurately describes¹¹² the different methods of colonization in America, when he writes: "Spanish civilization crushed the Indian; English civilization scorned and neglected him; French civilization embraced and cherished him." This program of French colonization was carried out to a high degree in Acadia in the Capuchin Abenaki *Seminary* at Port Royal.

The education of Indians was surely not a very attractive occupation for the Capuchins. It appears that the Micmacs rebelled less against being educated than their Abenaki or Montagnais brothers. Father Ignatius calls the *Seminary* in 1656 simply *Abenaki Seminary*, using the designation Abenaki in the modern sense of Algonquin. Probably the Micmac children living in the neighborhood

¹⁰⁹ *Acta S. C. de Prop. Fide*, 7 Maii, 1646, p. 91r, quoted by Cesinale, III, p. 678; Candide, *op. cit.*, p. 335.

¹¹⁰ *Brevis Relatio of 1656*, published in "Report concern. Canadian Archives", Ottawa, 1905, pp. 333 and 337.

¹¹¹ Rochemonteix, I, pp. 221-227, 280-289.

¹¹² *Jesuits in North America*, p. 44.

of Port Royal were always day scholars or externs. The Capuchin Fathers had invaluable assistants in this arduous work in their humble lay-brothers. Several of these had acquired a remarkable mastery of the Indian dialects. Brother Elzear, for instance, had, to quote the *Relatio* of Ignatius of Paris, "spent nine or ten full years at Pentagoet (Castine, Maine), and was quite familiar with the Abenaki language of those parts, and had by his great probity and his most Christian conversations prepared several of the heathen for the Faith, and had taught them the articles of our religion simply and effectively."¹¹³ The above-mentioned Brothers Felix of Troyes and Francis Mary of Paris were quite familiar with the Indian language of Acadia, Father Ignatius tells us.¹¹⁴ They were also teachers in the Port Royal *Seminary*. Simultaneously with the *Seminary* for Indian boys a boarding-school for Indian girls was maintained at Port Royal. It was conducted on the same plan as the boy's institute; co-education of Indian and French girls, some of the pupils externs and others interns. We do not know the date of erection of the *Seminary for Abenaki girls*, neither do we know the name of the first Superioress or Directress. It had been existing for some time in 1641. From a report of the Capuchin missionary, Pacificus of Provins, who had labored in the Acadian Mission, we learn that in 1641 the charge of Directress was entrusted to the noble Madame de Brice of Auxerre. This pious lady was the mother of two Capuchin missionaries, the Fathers Leonard and Paschal, both energetic workers in the Acadian Mission. Father Paschal was stationed for some time at Port Royal, where both mother and son were engaged in the noble work of civilizing the Indians. Under the direction of Madame de

¹¹³ In *Report*, pp. 334, 338; *Candide*, *Port-Royal*, pp. 334-335; *Jeron*, p. 295.

¹¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 336, 341.

Brice the *Seminary* made rapid progress. Madame de Brice passed twelve years in this charitable work. Only brutal force could bring her glorious apostolate to a tragical end. Le Borgne, from whom the late D'Aunay had borrowed extensively, crossed the ocean in 1653 to collect this debt by force. He took possession of Port Royal, not without great injustice. "He forcibly banished," to quote the *Relatio* of Father Ignatius of Paris, "the Capuchin Fathers Cosmas de Mantes and Gabriel de Joinville from Port Royal, together with Madame de Brice, Directress of the *Seminary* for the Abenakis. These persons he put in prison and detained on his ships for five whole months. On the removal of the leading Missionaries and the Directress, everything forthwith fell into confusion."¹¹⁵ Father Ignatius places this event in the year 1652. If the original text contains this figure, the worthy missionary must have committed an error. Le Borgne crossed the ocean for the first time in 1653, as Moreau conclusively proves. The Duke of Vendôme was appointed Governor of Acadia in 1652 and Le Borgne sailed the following spring to Acadia.¹¹⁶ Moreover, Father Ignatius says explicitly that less than a year afterwards nearly all of the impious Christians came to a wretched end. This happened in 1654, when the English occupied Acadia. When Le Borgne returned to France in the Fall of 1653, the Capuchins re-established the *seminaries*, but on August 16, 1654, Port Royal capitulated to the English, and the Indian *Seminaries* were finally closed.¹¹⁷ With the coming of the English, a blight settled on Acadia, for "naught but tradition remains of the beautiful village of Grand Pré" and of the Indian Seminaries in the Acadian "forest primeval". "We shall behold no

¹¹⁵ *Relatio*, pp. 336, 340-341.

¹¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 261; *Collection*, I, p. 140.

¹¹⁷ Moreau, pp. 261-262; *Collection*, I, pp. 145-149; Rameau, pp. 108-109; Candide, *Port-Royal*, p. 335; Jeron, pp. 295-296.

more our homes in the village of Grand Pré", we shall see no more Indian Seminaries at Port Royal. "Father Felician . . . had taught them their letters," but no longer were the Indians taught "out of the selfsame book" with the Acadians.

"Ignatius of Paris," writes Rameau,¹¹⁸ "has left us an interesting report of the labors of the Capuchins (he calls them Recollects), which were divided between care of souls and instruction given to the children of the Indians and the colonists. We have here something similar to the establishment organized by the Sulpitians somewhat later at Montreal. It must be regretted very much that on the one hand circumstances thwarted its consolidation and that on the other hand the Order of the Recollects (that is, Capuchins) did not display the same activity and the same energy in its development as the Sulpitians showed at Montreal." The Sulpitians were very successful later on with their educational institutions at Montreal. But, as we remarked above, they signally failed in their *Indian* seminary (1668-1671). The Capuchins had better results than all other Indian educators before 1671, and that in spite of the adverse political conditions of Acadia and in spite of their habitual poverty.

[*To be continued.*]

¹¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 89.

THROUGH SOUTH AMERICA'S SOUTHLAND.¹

BY THE REV. FRANCIS P. SIEGFRIED.

One likes to think that many of the readers of these RECORDS have enjoyed what some one has called "a liberal education", to say nothing of the pleasure, of following the Conquistadores under the expert guidance of Dr. Zahm by the aid of his two earlier volumes: *Up the Orinoco and Down the Magdalena* and *Along the Andes and Down the Amazon*. The former of these works appeared in 1910 under the author's pen name, "H. J. Mozans". The second was published in 1911 under the same pseudonym. Both volumes were subsequently reviewed in the RECORDS; so that nothing need here be added either by way of description or commendation. Together they present an inspiring and a richly suggestive picture of South America's Northland.

The volume under review takes us through the Southland of the American Continent; although just as its predecessors tell the main things about the Upper Westland, so the present volume contains much concerning the Pacific borders farther down the coast. The three volumes constitute, therefore, a trilogy in which the salient and most interesting features of South America—the land

¹ *Following the Conquistadores*. Through South America's Southland. With an account of the Roosevelt scientific expedition to South America. By the Reverend J. A. Zahm, C.S.C., Ph.D. (H. J. Mozans), author of "Up the Orinoco and Down the Magdalena," "Along the Andes and Down the Amazon," "The Quest of El Dorado," "Woman in Science," etc. New York and London: D. Appleton & Company, 1916. Pp. xvii-526.

and the people—are portrayed. It is hardly necessary to say that the work as a whole is unique. It stands quite by itself, having no peer, no equal in the class of literature to which it belongs.

Many books have been written about South America, especially in recent years—enough, indeed, to fill with their titles a goodly catalogue; but it will be venturing little to assert that there is none comparable to the present. Probably this statement to some will sound fulsome and exaggerated. Nevertheless it is made with full deliberation and can be—no, not easily, but with due investigation and comparison—verified. Suffice it here to allege one title in its justification, that is the comprehensive viewpoint from which the author has seen his subject. There are many books dealing more fully with the history of the South American States collectively and individually. Many others that treat of the country and its inhabitants in greater geographical and ethnological detail. Others again that consider specifically the economic and industrial aspects and possibilities of South America. One will look in vain, however, for a single work in which the primary and universal forces that have made South America what it is to-day and what it promises to be in the future—if those forces are permitted to work out their normal efficiency—are so unmistakably discovered, so vitally penetrated or so worthily exhibited.

If it be asked what are these formative forces, the answer is not easy to give, for some of them are intangible, impalpable. Nevertheless the reflective reader will discern them in the narrative before us. They are in the first place the spiritual energies that lived and wrought in the souls of the Conquistadores and of which the peoples of the Southland—notably the Argentines and the Chileans—are the inheritors.

The spirit of the Spanish Conquistadores—those of the

sword checked and directed by those of the cross—lies back of whatever is best and noblest and most enduring in the culture of the South Americans of to-day. Now add to this intangible energy another which is only less impalpable, the racial and the national elements and you have a second and a third coefficient.

One who reads Dr. Zahm's timely chapter on "The Progressive Paulistas" will recognize the powerful influence which the amalgamation of Spanish with Indian blood has had upon civilization, notably in southern Brazil. The primitive, sylvestral, animal character of the aborigines, tempered, elevated and refined by the better elements of the Spaniard, has begotten a strain of human energy which has conquered the tropical jungle and raised up, in a relatively short time, cities in the wilderness which for economic progress, architectural beauty, intellectual culture are unsurpassed in all the modern world. But to the racial must be added the national factor. The influence of Italian, but more particularly of German, immigration upon South America is beyond measurement. On these points the reader may be referred to those parts of the present volume which relate to the author's experience in Brazil and in Chile.

Another power at work in South American progress is, of course, the forces of nature, of climate, forest, mountain and plain. It is a mistake to regard the country as a land forever either sweltering in torrid heats, or drowned by torrential rains, or submerged beneath boundless swamps and miasmal morass. In certain portions of the Southlands these obstacles to human comfort and progress are, of course, to be found. On the other hand, they are far less extensive than they are usually supposed to be, while they are far surpassed by their opposites. Again we must refer the reader to Dr. Zahm's personal experience of the delightful climatic conditions and the comparative absence

of the terrible scourges which the Northern traveler is supposed to hazard if he venture on or below the Equator. To analyze more fully any one of the above-mentioned factors would be more than enough to exhaust the space available for this paper. We must content ourselves with some references to Dr. Zahm's treatment of the Conquistadores. The Spanish conquerors are, like many another hitherto misunderstood and maligned hero and sage of former times, gradually coming unto their own. As the author before us observes, owing "to the indefatigable labors of recent investigators—especially in Chile—and their bringing to light precious documents, long buried and forgotten in old archives in Spain and in her former dependencies in America, we are now able to rectify numerous errors respecting both men and institutions of early colonial times. Many of these errors, it is now discovered, were due to misleading, verbal reports, or to local passions and jealousies against which certain of the early chroniclers were not sufficiently guarded. As a result of these exhaustive and conscientious researches, it is now possible to rewrite, with more approximation to truth, the lives of some of the most illustrious of the Conquistadores, about whom, until recently, but little was known outside of their participation in some of the more notable events of the conquest. We find that many of the Conquistadores, whom we have been wont to regard as simple adventurers—as ignorant as they were vicious—were, in reality, men of noble qualities, both intellectual and moral. We learn that they were skillful captains in the wars of Italy and Flanders, in which they served under the banners of the most renowned generals of their century; that, far from being the offscourings of society, and refugees from justice, as were not a few of those who made their way to Cuba, Espanola and the Spanish Main, during the time of Columbus, the companions of Valdivia, not to speak of Conquistadores in other parts of

the New World, were scions of some of the most illustrious families of Spain, men who had disposed of their inherited possessions in the land of their birth in order to seek fortune and glory beyond the seas. In view of this recently acquired knowledge, a distinguished Chilean writer does not hesitate to declare that nearly all the Conquistadores of Chile were not only men of good family, but also men of some education—"los Conquistadores de Chile casi todos al par que hidalgos, eran hombres de alguna instruccion".

And what were the motives that actuated these heroes of old Castile? The desire to spread the Kingdom of Christ, the lust of gold, and the thirst for glory. The Conquistadores had their faults, their vices; some of them may have been monsters of cruelty, though this trait is now known to have been greatly exaggerated by uninformed and misinformed writers. Nevertheless "all but the most reprobate of the conquerors ever retained a consciousness in their dealings with the aborigines of their duties as Christians and as the soldiers of rulers who had left nothing undone that could conduce to the welfare, spiritual and temporal, of their Indian subjects overseas." On the other hand, "Even for these God-fearing men, the lure of gold and the love of glory were all-powerful. In the case of many of the leading Conquistadores, it would be difficult to decide which was the more potent incentive to action. Some of the more noted of them seemed to despise gold, and, as a matter of fact, actually died poor men, when it was in their power to amass the wealth of a Hindu potentate. But there was ever present the unquenchable desire to distinguish themselves by feats of arms, to achieve immortality as had so many of their countrymen in the land of El Cid Campeador."

Doctor Zahm may or may not have had in mind explicitly to exhibit the influence of the forces that actuated the Conquistadores upon the South Americans of our day. None

the less the suggestion of that influence exhales everywhere from his stirring narrative.

The Conquerors were men of heroic mold, themselves the product of the best influences of the ages of faith and of a sane—not quixotic—chivalry. Pizarro—the much-maligned conqueror of the Incas—and his companions were undoubtedly influenced by the desire of gold. But as Dr. Zahm observes, “the desire was secondary. For they recognized that, high above gold, there is a sphere in which man ennobles himself by serving God and humanity. They desired glory, but they desired to secure it by propagating the religion of Christ which their fatherland, notwithstanding the weakness of poor humanity, loved with an ardor that has never been surpassed. They were first and foremost crusaders of the Faith, and could say with Calderon’s *Principe Constante*,

La fe de Dios à engrandecer venimos
Suyo será el honor, suya la gloria.

They had the faith that guided Columbus across the Sea of Darkness, that carried Cortes to the capital of Montezuma, that conducted Quesada to the plateau of Cundinamarca, that led Orellana down the mighty Amazon,—the faith, which as Lope de Vega beautifully expresses it, gave

Al Rey infinitas tierras.
Y à Dios infinitas almas.

With the Conquistadores of the sword and the Conquistadores of the cross acting in concert and striving to carry out the instructions of Pope and sovereign respecting the native races, it is not surprising that such beneficent results were achieved, and that the Indians of Latin America to-day are so numerous and occupy so much higher a plane in civilized life than do their maltreated brethren in the United States. Had they not come under the baleful in-

fluence of soulless adventurers or heartless *encomenderos*, the results would be far more glorious, and the historian would now be spared the recital of those stories of cruelty and atrocity which have so dimmed the splendors of the otherwise marvelous achievements of the Spanish conquest.

The author here touches on an industrial system about which there has existed and still exists no little confusion of ideas as well as of offhand vituperation dealt out to the Conquerors. It may not be amiss to transcribe some observations from the work at hand concerning this subject. "The *Encomiendas* were lands granted in trust to the Conquistadores. It was essentially the Inca system of land tenure as modified by Spanish feudalism—a system which prevailed in Chile until it was abolished by the celebrated Irish governor, Ambrosio O'Higgins, a system which was the forerunner of the present *inquilino* system that now obtains to so great an extent in the Chilean Republic. The *encomienda* was in reality a trust, or fief, and the *encomendero*, in return for the labor and tribute of his dependent Indians, was bound to protect them and provide them with Christian instruction. The *encomenderos* were intended to form a knightly class whose duty it was to defend, enrich and ennoble the kingdom and to care for the Indians."

Most of the denunciations of this system proceed from lack of knowledge of the time when it was introduced and ignorance of the methods of government in Europe during the same period.

It is unreasonable to demand that the Conquistadores in America should have adopted a different system from that with which they were familiar in Europe and which they had every reason to consider the best. They were soldiers and not philosophers. And soldiers are accustomed to transplant the institutions of their own country without instituting reforms.

In the Old World, at the time of the conquest, feudal-

ism still held sway, although in a more mitigated form in Spain than in other countries. The seignor exercised jurisdiction over the inhabitants within his dominions, but with the obligation to defend the country against its enemies, to supply a certain number of troops at his own expense and to provide for all the costs of public administration of his own seignoralty. The vassal retained the ownership of his land, but with the obligation of tribute, either in money or in kind, to his overlord as an acknowledgment of his jurisdiction.

This was the form of government which the Conquistadores strove to introduce into America. Valdivia prided himself on his paternal treatment of the conquered race and had a care not to deprive the Indians of the lands which they actually occupied. For the encomienda did not give the encomendero a right to such lands. They were, however, frequently purchased from the Indians at a good price. When awarding encomiendas to his soldiers, Valdivia gave them only *terrenos vacos*, that is, lands without an owner. As the indigenous population was small in comparison to the great extent of territory, and as the lands actually cultivated by the natives were of very restricted area, there was a surplus of vacant lands for the Spaniards, without appropriating those which were occupied by the aborigines.

Considering then the dominant ideas in Spain, as well as in other parts of Europe during the sixteenth century, respecting feudalism, it is difficult to see how the Spaniards could have improved on the form of government which they introduced into South America. To the credit of Valdivia and his successors, it must be said that they were always interested in the perpetuation of the indigenous races, and devised suitable measures for the attainment of so worthy an object. These measures were approved by the viceroy of Peru and by the Kings of Spain, who left noth-

ing undone to protect the lives and property of the Indians, and this at a time, be it remembered, when our New England colonists were doing everything in their power to exterminate the red man in the most brutal manner.

The Indians of the *encomiendas* were, it is true, obliged to work. Women, however, boys under eighteen and men over fifty were excused from enforced labor. More than this, those who labored received some salary, and they were allowed, moreover, the necessary time for planting and cultivating their own fields. Even those engaged in the *placer* mines had, by special regulation, the right to retain for their own use all the gold which they might find during one day of each week.

If, however, one wish to see the best spirit of the conquest at work—the spirit of the conquering warriors and overlords tempered and controlled by the *Conquistadores* of the cross—one need but study it at work in the Jesuit reductions of Paraguay. We here touch upon another of those subjects which ignorance and bigotry have succeeded in beclouding and distorting. Let the reader turn to the few pages which Dr. Zahm has devoted to the Paraguayan reductions and he will behold an industrial system that attained a wonderful measure of success because it was based on the unchanging principles that underlie all true peace and happiness. Aptly does Southey sing in the “*Tale of Paraguay*”:

In history's mournful map, the eye
On Paraguay, as on a sunny spot,
May rest complacent: to humanity,
There and there only, hath a peaceful lot
Been granted, by Ambition troubled not,
By Avarice undebased, exempt from care,
By perilous passions undisturbed. And what
If Glory never rested her standard there,
Nor with her clarion blast awoke the slumbering air.

Content and cheerful Piety were found
Within those humble walls. From youth to age
The simple dwellers paced their even round
Of duty, not desiring to engage
Upon the world's contentious stage,
Whose ways they wisely had been trained to dread:
Their inoffensive lives in pupillage
Perpetually, but peacefully, they led,
From all temptation saved, and sure of daily bread.

But we must stop. And yet we have said nothing at all about what most vitally concerns the Catholic reader, namely, the religious conditions prevailing in South America. What we glean on this head from Dr. Zahm's experience is that the Church in South America is by no means either in the decrepit or the debased condition in which she is painted by some travelers and sectarian missionaries. Everywhere, not alone in the large cities of Brazil, Argentina, Chile and Paraguay, but even in the out-of-the-way missions of Matto Grosso in the heart of Brazil, he finds evidences of vigorous faith. Splendid churches adorn the proud cities. How crowded they may be, especially by men, we are not explicitly informed. Magnificent institutions of learning and beneficence abound and flourish everywhere. Notably the convent schools are signalized for their attractiveness and efficiency. Even Mr. Roosevelt feels his sense of admiration stimulated as he beholds the evidences of youthful scholarliness and is forced to exclaim: "By George, this is wonderful! This is the best we have seen yet. I would not have missed it for anything!" Indeed the whole picture of the religious status is so brightly painted that those who have become accustomed to the pictures limned by some other hands feel a tendency to look for the shadows and are tempted to ask: "Are there none in the reality?" To which query we might answer: Either Dr. Zahm has not come upon them

or he deems them negligible in comparison with the generally prevailing brightness.

Be this as it may, Dr. Zahm has revealed the Church in South America to his fellow Catholics of the North in a light such as has never been reflected upon it before. The heroic labors of the pioneer missionaries are here described in true and just colors. They sowed and others have entered into the harvest; and, while the reapers may not always represent the unselfish toil of the sowers, the grain that is garnering is large even if it be not the fullness of promise. But not only his co-religionists in this country are enriched by this volume, but Americans generally will be indebted to it; for herein is revealed the character of Spanish Americans and their home as never before. We, of the North may justly glory in our civil liberty and be proud of our forefathers who purchased it for us by their blood. But South Americans have no less inspiring examples of patriotism to emulate. Few pages of history reflect such splendors as do those which tell of the struggles of the South Americans for their political and civil freedom. And in the volume before us there are none that so accurately and so brilliantly give back those glories.

We may not close our all too inadequate account of this splendid volume without a word on its artistic form. Never has it been the reviewer's good fortune to meet with a work of the kind wherein so much grace and richness of literary art have combined to ennoble and beautify its subject. The wealth of the world's literature—Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, French, German—as well as the indigenous poetry of the Southlands, has lent itself generously and gracefully to the enrichment and ornamentation of the style. Perhaps the foregoing extracts may in some measure, however slight, serve to illustrate this point. The work reveals itself as the ripened fruitage of vast reading hardly surpassed by the author's widely-traveled experi-

ence. Like Ulysses of old, he "has seen many men and cities", and can summon, at will, the fairest scenes of nature's universal loveliness to furnish him points of comparison with the beauties he discovers in these southern wonderlands. Happily, too, the book-maker's art harmonizes well with it all. Letter-press and illustrations are apt and worthy. Only the map in which are traced the author's journeyings is not so satisfactory. One feels like grumbling when he seeks vainly again and again on the chart for places and rivers mentioned in the text. A fuller map would be a desideratum for a future edition.

AN OLD-TIME CONTROVERSY

THE ASHLEY-ST. PÉ LETTERS

EDITED BY REV. JOSEPH J. MURPHY, J.C.D.

(*Continued*)

III. LETTER.

THE SAME TO THE SAME.

MOST HONORABLE AND ALSO MOST BELOVED SIR:

A letter of yours, written on the 16th of October, 1750, after many comings and goings has reached me at length, though late, and I am answering it at the first opportunity given. Truly, as I read and re-read the things set down by your hand, I am imbued with the deeper pleasure the longer your letters put before me a man most honored and most dear to me, a man who carries on a controversy of opinions, not of affections, not only ably but courteously and kindly, a man whom I love and long for as my eternal comrade in the home of eternal bliss. As he speaks to my eyes I love him, and how much richer would be my joy, if I could also be glad in his countenance and delight in his charming conversation. Believe me, most excellent Sir, it would be a pleasure for me as for you, if we could discourse in speech regarding the true faith necessary to salvation, and discourse with the endeavor to profit, not with the lust of conquest, so that neither should the victor triumph in haughtiness nor the vanquished blush in shame; but a victory would come honorable to each, profitable to each, since it would come not merely to the subtler dis-

putant, but both to him who modestly presented, and to him who sincerely recognized, the truth—for the more I feel in my heart love for you kindling ardently every day, so much the graver is my fear, lest from entire lack of faith in one or the other of us, eternity may sever those whom time has joined in bonds of friendship.

Alas! most learned Sir, that you inquire as in wonder: “Why should I grieve because you do not belong to this or that party of Christians?” Is Christ divided? Can the true church of Christ, within which is salvation, as in Noah’s ark, and outside of which is perdition, be at the same time in this and in that party of men who contradict each other in faith and worship? Is it not true that “*a kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate, and that every city or house divided against itself shall not stand?*” (Matt. 12:25). If Christ’s kingdom be divided and desolated will not the gates of hell prevail?

You contend that it matters little to you: “Whether you shall be among Peter’s or Paul’s followers.” Pray let us be among the disciples of both, since both were Christ’s disciples. The ashes of both repose at Rome; the blood of both has irrigated, and thereby enriched, the Roman church; and, what is of chief import, the faith of both, the Roman faith, is proclaimed in the whole world.

But, you say: “You have the kingdom of God within and it suffices you”. “*You reign without us, and I would to God you did reign, that we also might reign with you*” (1 Cor. 4:8). “If you have the kingdom of God within, you will never lament being outside the pale of the Catholic Church.” But so long as either one of us shall be outside the pale of the Catholic Church, so long must both of us lament that he stands aloof from the inner kingdom of God. Since these things are so, let me lay down the following points, either to be granted by you or defended by me, as a basis of all future controversy between us or else as a bond of agreement.

1. There is one and only one church of Christ, which "*if one heareth not, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican*" (Matt. 18: 17), and hence as an alien from God's kingdom.

2. One or the other of us lies outside the bosom of this church.

3. Christ's supreme truthfulness and most bountiful loving kindness comes to naught unless that church perseveres, visible and indefectible, from the Holy Ghost's descent upon the apostles even to the end of the world.

4. The following are the four chief marks by which it becomes visible: (a) It is *one* in faith, self-consistent and ever the same, rejecting all sects and rejected by them.

(b) It is *holy* with the holiness of miracles for proving the holiness of its doctrine, (with the holiness) of its ministry, of its discipline, of its zeal, finally, of its morals, at least in some members.

(c) It is *catholic*. It preceded in time, and will outlast, every pseudo-Christian sect. It is known and diffused, at least gradually, in all places. Compared with the various heresies, one by one, it has flourished longer and is diffused more widely.

(d) It is *apostolic*. It preserves the faith spread abroad by the apostles and the government established by them; it rejoices in its legitimate successors of the apostles, and has for the chief of its bishops the successor of the prince of the apostles.

5. These four marks fit the Roman Church alone. If you grant them, you will be on our side; if we do not establish them, we shall dispute forever and in vain.

Having premised these things, I run through briefly the replies of your letter to my objections.

1. You ask: "If all parts of the scripture are not equally divine and to be guarded by the same admonition of God". I answer anathema to those who deny it. No part of holy

scripture is it right to take away, no part to corrupt. Turn back that weapon against those who have corrupted your English Bible, or who embrace unsound opinions as to the true Canon of the holy scriptures. It is impious for the individual mind of man to add to, or subtract from, the sacred codices. Not even the divine mind can subtract from them, for He cannot deny Himself. Under the inspiration of God the Catholic Church could, not subtract from but, add to them, just as in former times it added in due succession the parts of the New Testament to the Old. I believe with you, and most firmly profess, that the same Spirit, who inspired John, inspired Paul and any other pen of the divine scribe writing swiftly; nor would I have you admit any interpretation contrary to any part of holy scripture, though fortified by any kind of authority, but I would have you believe that that is the genuine interpretation of the sacred words which, relying on divine authority, mother church puts forth.

2. With regard to traditions not written in the sacred codices: "You profess ignorance as to how many and what they are, and where they can be found". I answer that they can be found chiefly in the definitions of the General Councils, and in the consenting opinions of the Fathers and ecclesiastical Doctors. These traditions may relate either to faith or discipline. In matters of discipline the church has the power and the duty to make some change occasionally, in view of the varying circumstances of the times. But in matters of faith, it is not true that she has changed anything, or that she has perceived, taught, defined contraries. When you reply to that expression of the apostle: "*Hold fast the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle*" (2 Thes. 2: 14), you make the gratuitous supposition that the same things, which the faithful heard from him in discourse, "were written in his epistles, if not verbatim, at least in substance". There

is no force in what you say next: "Matters of the highest importance would never have been left to the treacherous memory of men", nor is what you say about the observance of Sunday either weighty or satisfactory, for you do not indicate in what passage of holy scripture it is said that the apostles were wont to celebrate Sunday, to the neglect and disregard of the Sabbath. I surmise you had in mind Apoc. 1: 10 ("*I was in the spirit on the Lord's day*"), but from what source, pray, do you hold that *that* Lord's day was the same as the one we so name, and that this was to be the feast day for Christians in place of the Sabbath? Not, surely, from the text of the apostle, but, as I indicated, from real tradition alone.

3. I regret from the bottom of my heart that, driven by the constraint of your sect, you are obliged to weaken the force of that divine promise: "*The gates of hell shall not prevail against*" my church (Matt. 16: 18). And, indeed, most honorable man, how shall they not prevail, how is it that the church stands and will stand, "*the pillar and ground of the truth*" (I Tim. 4: 15), how is Christ, "*the way, and the truth and the life*" (John 14: 6), with it "*even to the consummation of the world*" (Matt. 28: 20), if (as you say) "neither the whole church, nor any one in the church, knows all things with full certainty", nay if "the people of God may fall into most fatal errors?" Therefore Christ lied when He said of the Paraclete: "*He will teach you all things*" (John 14: 26), and again: "*He will teach you all truth*" (John 16: 13). In whom, then, were we baptized? Was it not in that Spirit whom we received, not indeed by reasoning and warping the scriptures to our own understanding, but by believing, even by believing those "*whom the Holy Ghost has placed bishops to rule the church of God*" (Acts 20: 28), by believing those to whom it was said: "*Going, therefore, teach ye all nations*" (Matt. 28: 19).

You assert that "it is true that the church stands on the truthfulness of God", but (you should) add: on the truthfulness of God promising and giving infallibility to His teaching church, so that it is certain and a matter of faith that: "*He that heareth you, heareth me (the Truth), and he that despiseth you, despiseth me (the Truth)*" Luke 10:16).

Well, but you say: "*We see now through a glass in a dark manner*" (1 Cor. 13:12). Even so; but the darkness is full of truth, and the glass is clear, and we do see, or, if you prefer, we believe, in such wise that our faith is a "*reasonable service*" (Rom. 12:1), and "*the evidence of things that appear not*" (Heb. 11:1).

Your comparison of the church with the ancient synagogue, sometimes invisible, is not just. For the Gentiles could have salvation outside the synagogue, but whoever is outside the true church of Christ is a "*heathen and publican*" (Matt. 18:17). Hence, in order that He, who will-eth not that any one should perish but "*that all should come to the knowledge of the truth*" (1 Tim. 2:4), may sufficiently provide for man's salvation, it is needful that the mystical city of the church be seated on a mountain that all nations may flow to it, and that its light, set upon a candlestick, may shine to all that are in the house of our mortality. (Cf. Matt. 5:14-15; Isaías 2:2.)

You join error to error by reasoning thus: "If Peter could err, you concede that the whole church could err", for, in the first place, if Peter erred when, through fear of the Jews, he refused to eat with the Gentiles (cf. Gal. 2:11-14), he erred in a practical, not a theoretical, matter, he erred when he acted, that is, he sinned; he did not err by persuading to error, by teaching, or publishing, or defining error, and even if he had so erred, only this much would follow, that the chief pontiff is not an infallible teacher of truth when all, or the majority of the bishops in apostolic

succession dissent,¹ but it would by no means follow that the church, with which Christ is "*even to the consummation of the world*" (Matt. 28:20), could be so abandoned by Him, and sometimes has been so abandoned by Him, that the majority of the bishops, the rulers of this church, in company with its head, could embrace, foster and promote error, so that the visible church should perish, the light should be under a bushel, and that mountain, of which Isaias speaks, that "*mountain of the Lord prepared on the top of mountains*" (Isaias 2:2), should be sunk to the depths of the valleys, while the gates of hell prevailed.

If the church is a tree, you have decided that its root is in Jerusalem. I, on the contrary, argue thus: its root is not where once was, and now is not, the city over which Jesus wept because it had not known the time of its visitation (Luke 19:41), the city of which it was predicted that not one stone would remain upon another, as in fact it has not (ibid.), the city of the men who "*filled up the measure of their fathers*" so "*that upon them might come all the just blood that was shed*" (cf. Matt. 23:32-35) and especially the blood of the Lord, upon whose hearts would remain the veil of Moses even to the present day (2 Cor. 3:15), the city from which Christ commanded His faithful ones to depart so soon as they should see its ruin imminent (Matt. 24:15), the city which, since it rejected the word of God, crucified the Christ of the Lord and judged itself unworthy of eternal life (Acts 13:46): wherefore very quickly, when the apostles turned to the Gentiles, "*the*

¹ This was written long before the Vatican Council (1870), which defined as "a divinely revealed dogma" that "the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra* . . . is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer wished His Church to be endowed in defining doctrines of faith and morals; and consequently that such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of their own nature, and not by reason of the Church's consent". See Denziger, *Enchiridion*, n. 1682 (9th ed.).—EDITOR.

kingdom of God was taken away from it and given to a nation yielding the fruits thereof" (Matt. 21:43).

To all the apostles jointly, but to Peter in a special manner, were the keys given by Christ; nor is Peter, as you judge, a mere janitor of the kingdom of heaven, since it is his office also to confirm those brethren, to feed those sheep, to rule those rulers "*whom the Holy Ghost has placed bishops to rule the church of God*" (Acts 20:28). Yet there is not, as you infer, a three-fold foundation of the church, but Peter is the primary and chief stone of the apostolic foundation, for he is Peter and upon this rock (*petra*) Christ has built the church. I wonder that you do not see that the primacy is granted to Peter in all those texts concerning the authority of Peter, which I remember bringing together in the previous letter. Pray read it over, if you can spare the time.

As regards the council at Jerusalem, the errors imputed to certain pontiffs, as Liberius and Honorius, the Roman chair of Peter, and Paul's censure of Cephas (Gal. 2:11-14)—whom many conjecture, not absurdly, to have been a disciple different from the apostle Peter—I should like you to consult some first-class Catholic controversialist, for it is impossible to include all the disputed points of controversies in the narrow bounds of a letter. But you are not persuasive when you say: "Peter was by no means proud of his Roman see, since he called Rome Babylon". For, I ask you to observe, it is the Rome devoted to idols that is called Babylon by Peter and John, and its overthrow is predicted so that there is to arise, out of the debris of unbelieving Rome, a new Jerusalem, a Christian Rome, whose founder, Peter, is to be far more fortunate and glorious than Romulus of old.

You ask where the Lord has given to anyone, directly or by proxy, the power of making laws in the church. And I ask, in turn, what do these utterances mean? "*Feed my*

lambs, feed my sheep", said to Peter (John 21: 15-17); "He that heareth you, heareth me; he that despiseth you, despiseth me", to the apostles (Luke 10: 16); "The Holy Ghost has placed you bishops to rule the church of God", to the bishops (Acts 20: 28); "If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican", to the church (Matt. 18: 17). What do these grant? We do not grant to Peter, to the bishops, to the whole church, any other authority of ruling than what is founded on these words. This authority Christ has delegated to be given to the bishops "*even to the consummation of the world*" (Matt. 28: 20), or as long as He will be in the church with His apostles, who live, teach and rule the church of God, not now personally, but by their legitimate successors, by whom you refuse to be ruled. What have you to say against this? I listen for the answer.

When there is opposed to your sect that authority of church government which the law and the testimony most efficaciously prove, you come back to the law and the testimony, and ask: "What say the Scriptures?" Most subtle Sir, and most keen searcher for better things, if among and for your friends better things can be said (to be), what sort of a circle is this wherein, even against your will, you shut your own self? You appeal to the law and to the testimony against the interpreters of the law and the testimony and against the judges of interpretations who are appointed by the law and the testimony. Who, then, shall be umpire between you, on the one side, and, on the other, all pastors and teachers of the Catholic Church? Not you, nor your sect. That would be unfair, for you do not arrogate to yourselves what you deny to all, judicial authority and infallibility. Who then? Surely the Holy Ghost; but by whose mouth will He speak? We come back, at your bidding, to the law and the testimony. Willingly am I involved in your circle as I try to extricate you. "*Receive*

ye the Holy Ghost" (John 20:22), was said to whom? "*Going, therefore, teach ye all nations*" (Matt. 28:19), was commanded to whom? "*He that heareth you, heareth me*" (Luke 10:16), was declared to whom? "*Behold I am with you*" (Matt. 28:20), was asseverated to whom? "*The Paraclete shall teach you all truth*" (John 16:13), was promised to whom? Pray beware lest it be said to your party: "*God resisteth the proud, but to the humble he giveth grace*" (1 Peter 5:5).

Rightly you admonish me that "*in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision: but faith that worketh by charity*" (Gal. 5:6). Nothing therefore avails or can avail for salvation to those men who have suffered shipwreck in regard to faith, unless, as they emerge from the waves, they reach Peter's boat, wherein Jesus sleeps securely, though at times it be tossed by storms however great.

God grant that, using that bark with us, rejoicing in Peter as helmsman, glorying in Christ as the leader and companion in the way, peaceful in Him who giveth peace, and not "*of little faith*", you may direct your course as a Catholic to the port of bliss and be called a saint. With this salvation, God save you forever. So wishes your most devoted and obedient servant in Christ.

J. B. ST. PÉ.

IV. LETTER.

THE SAME TO THE SAME.

SIR, MOST REVEREND AND BELOVED IN CHRIST:—

So seldom does an opportunity of exchanging letters present itself, that if ever on either side we are somewhat too late in replying I should not consider it to be a fault, even if it is such. We understand, and we mutually give and take this liberty.

I have received your last (Jan. 14), full to the brim of courtesy and good feeling, which is just like you. Pray

accept what I feel, owe and pay—very many and very great thanks.

Although we have already argued back and forth enough and more than enough if we really sought the truth, still for my love for the truth I cannot but descend once more into the arena, now that I am challenged by you again, though mildly, and as though you were doing something different. Without further preface, I seize the sword of Truth Itself, and come to the matter in hand.

"It rejoices you," my dear Sir, "that there is so much *charity* in men whose *opinions* differ from your own." You refer, doubtless, to opinions relating to religion, to *faith*; you refer to charity that is true, Christian, supernatural, that is diffused in men's hearts by the Holy Ghost. But I ask you whether there can be charity of this kind in those whose opinions are alien to the true faith, and who, accordingly, have not faith? You will surely say no, and with reason. I ask you again whether there could be true faith, in each of two parties, whose religious opinions are as far apart as darkness from light? Again, I think, you will say no, even against your will, seeing that *faith* is just as truly *one* and only one, as *God is one*. Consequently, since you declare of your own accord that we have charity—O! that you have said this truly—you necessarily grant that we have true faith also, and, since this is one, certainly then it will not be in those whose convictions are so different from ours.

You are glad that here, where, as you say, "there was formerly no knowledge of God and His Word, now such a good understanding of divine things abounds"; and, be that as it may, I accept the saying, and immediately the same argument recurs. For if among us a true knowledge of the true God flourishes, if understanding of divine things abounds, surely it will not be among those who differ from us as far as heaven from earth with regard to God

and the theory and practice of the religion established by God.

You lament "that the knowledge of the holy scriptures is not diffused far and wide". I, too, lament with you. You deem us fortunate in that we can examine the sacred codices at will. Yes indeed, I can account us blessed if we read them in that Spirit by whom they were written and dictated, and if we both believe and act strictly according to them. But if (we read them) in a different (spirit), that is, our own individual particular (spirit), most wretched should I account us whom that word, "*more piercing than any two-edged sword*" (Heb. 4: 12), instead of "*quickening by the spirit, would slay by the letter*" (2 Cor. 3: 6). Are the Jews fortunate who read the Old Testament daily, but whose senses are dulled, so that "*even until this day when Moses is read a veil is upon their hearts*" (ibid., v. 15)? But, Sir, how many among those who boast of the Christian name ought to be reckoned with the Jews? So many, surely, as you and I agree to number with the heretics, I mean Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Manichaeans, Pelagians, Socinians and others almost without number, whom Satan has spewed out of the foul jaws of hell to ravage the church of Christ. All these, forsooth, both have and read the divine writings, and, if you can believe them, they have not the least doubt that they understand them rightly, while, as a matter of fact, they pervert them to their own reprobate sense, and force them in every way in defence of their error.

You proceed with your questionings: "Do we not grieve that any men are deprived of the holy scriptures?" I, too, in turn, proceed to question: Does it not grieve us most of all that the holy scriptures result in eternal ruin to so many thousands of people, as I have just mentioned? "But," you say, "this comes from their own offense, seeing that they abuse so great a kindness of God." I admit it: but

please observe, does not this very fact evidently prove that not just any sort of scripture reading is either useful or necessary to *all*, but that a knowledge of the doctrines and precepts *contained* in the scriptures, together with (divine) grace, is enough to create and nurture faith and build up morals? But this knowledge can surely be had without reading them, for "*faith cometh by hearing*" (Rom. 10: 17), not by reading. Moreover the apostle does not say: "*How shall they believe him*", whom they have not read, but "*of whom they have not heard?*" (ibid., v. 14).

You felicitate yourself that there is no one under your ministry who does not have a Holy Bible at home. It is well; but, I pray you, how many of them are there to whom it could not be said, with better right, what Philip said to the eunuch (Acts 8: 30): "*Thinkest thou that thou understandest what thou readest?*", and who would not be bound to reply: "*And how can I, unless some man shew me?*" But what profit is reading without understanding?

What I write very concisely, please think over more fully. Meanwhile I come to those texts of holy scripture which you allege, I suppose, to prove the necessity of reading the scriptures. And indeed you cite

1. Habacuc (2: 14) "*For the earth shall be filled that men may know the glory of God*". But I would say, by your leave, this is not at all to the point, for there is not even one tiny word there concerning holy scripture or its reading. And when "*the earth was full of the knowledge of the glory of God*", it was filled by preaching, not writing, by hearing, not reading: "*Their sound hath gone forth into all the earth*" (Ps. 18: 5). And Christ did not command the apostles to write, but to preach: "*Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature*" (Mark 16: 15): "*And they going forth preached everywhere*" (ibid., v. 20). All preached; all did not write.

2. The text from Daniel (12: 4), at least in my opinion,

is not at all to the purpose, or certainly not much more: "*But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book, even to the time appointed; many shall pass over, and knowledge shall be manifold.*" For "*many shall run to and fro*" (A. V.), as you read, or as we better (read) "*many shall pass over*", does not so clearly mean that "*many will read this prophecy*" that there may not be another sense of this word, and that, too, a manifold and perhaps the genuine one. I grant that "*to peruse*", which I suspect² is read in the English version, would be unequivocal. But you should admit that your "*shall run to and fro*", and our "*shall pass over*", admit various senses, which there is not time to follow out, and so, if the conjecture may be allowed, the Holy Ghost seems to have added immediately, by the mouth of the angel: "*And knowledge shall be manifold*", as if He would say: When this prophecy, now sealed up, shall in due time have been unsealed, after many (years, or men, or events) have passed over, the understanding thereof shall be manifold and various. What wonder, then, if we petty men, amid mysteries so abstruse, are blind and grope and stammer, when Daniel himself, a little below (v. 8), admits of himself: "*And I heard and understood not*". Let us decline to flatter ourselves overmuch, and deem ourselves keener-eyed and wiser than the prophet.

3. What you adduce from Hebrews, 8: 10, does nothing for you, but much against you: "*I will give my laws into their minds, and in their hearts will I write them*". Nothing for you, for there is no mention there of reading the scriptures: much against you, for why should there be a reading of the sacred books after God had put His laws into men's minds and written them on their heart, as He there promises He will do? For that matter, what need of preaching if "*they shall not teach every man his neighbor*"

² The Authorized Version reads, "run to and fro", not "peruse".—ED.

and every man his brother, saying, *Know the Lord*" (ibid., v. 11).

4. You say: "Christ Himself, Our Lord, has given us a command", John 5:39, "*Search the scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlasting*". Really, Sir, to us? I do not see it, I do not believe it. And, if He gave it to anybody, it was, of course, to unbelieving Jews, His enemies and persecutors, whom He was addressing; and, if to the Jews, not to all sorts of ignorant men from the crowd, but to the leaders, the priests, the lawyers, who desired to slay Him (v. 18, "*Hereupon, therefore, the Jews sought to kill Him*"), but "*they feared the people*" (Luke 22:2); therefore, not to His disciples, who are not said to have been present at that time, and hence not to us. But come now, what if I should understand in the Indicative mood, what you understand in the Imperative,³ which sense, indeed, suits the Latin word equally well and harmonizes much better with the passage itself; it is very easy to prove this, but it would take a little too long. For the rest, you easily see why I do not delay on the English translation, which perhaps either twists or bends the text into a command.

5. I know full well what a tremendous "*Wo!*" Christ launches at the lawyers: "*For they have taken away the key of knowledge; and they themselves have not entered in, and those that were entering in, they have hindered*" (Luke 11:52). Far be that "*Wo!*" from us, and far it will be, I hope; for *we* neither took away the key of knowledge, whatever, indeed, that may be, nor do we hinder those who want to come in; nay we even invite and urge the unwilling, and as, far as it is lawful, "*compel them to come in*" (Luke 14:24). Among us the holy scriptures

³ NOTE.—The Latin text of this passage is "*Scrutamini scripturas*", which can be translated either "*Search the scriptures*" (imperative mood), or, "*You search the scriptures*" (indicative mood).—EDITOR.

lie open; they are made known, preached, explained, impressed continually on the faithful people by their rightful pastors, who, by virtue of their office, read them prayerfully and studiously, meditate on them, search them, and interpret them according to the definitions of the Councils, the expositions of the Fathers and Doctors, and thus according to the mind of the church. Moreover, the scriptures are read promiscuously by those whose spiritual guides judge that this reading would be profitable. But that (reading) is forbidden to those who, it is foreseen, would abuse it, whether from their ignorance, or weakness, or pride, or malice, or any other evil propensity, that is to say, we "*give not that which is holy to dogs*", nor "*cast pearls*", as well precious as divine, "*before swine*"; you know the rest (Matt. 7:6). Whoever, then, we are that read the scriptures, if we read rightly and Christianly, we read with this first caution, that we understand that "*no prophecy of scripture is made by private interpretation*" (2 Pet. 1:20); but the sense we think underlies it must be subjected to the sense of the church which is "*the pillar and ground of the truth*" (1 Tim. 3:15), so that if our (sense) is consonant with *that*, we then admit it, cleave to it, and use it for our edification, consolation and salvation, but if it be dissonant, we then and there reject it. . . . Many things occur to be added here; time does not allow it; I omit them, you will supply them.

6. You bring up, lastly, Acts 17:11: "*Now these were more noble than those in Thessalonica, who received the word with all eagerness, daily searching the scriptures, whether these things were so*", and you say: "Paul praises the Bereans because they daily searched the scriptures". Wait please: Paul is not praising, but Luke is narrating that the Bereans, *Jews* not yet Christians, received with all eagerness the word (not the written but the preached word), searching the scriptures daily to see if these things

were so, and he adds: "*And many indeed of them believed*" (v. 12). But because the more noble, eminent and learned Jews searched whether the testimony of the scriptures harmonized with Paul's preaching, this, if I mistake not, by no means proves that the holy scriptures ought to be discussed by the ordinary sort of Christians and tested by their scales; otherwise the most worthless people, the silliest girls, though laden with sins, will be the judges of controversies, and thence (will come) how great and ominous a multiplicity of opinions, sects and heresies? May God avert this, and to the bosom of the true and only true church either bring us back, or keep us in it, humble, docile, faithful to the end, Amen.

These notes of mine on your letters, too long, perhaps, for the subject, and yet, perchance, too short for its importance, you will take in fair and good part, as I hope, dearest Sir, and from them, too, I would have you know what my esteem for you is, and what my love towards you. I seem to myself to see in you a man naturally upright, honorable, loving the true and the good, and in whom this one thing is to be lamented, that he was born in a false church, this one thing to be blamed, that he is unwilling to renounce his preconceived opinions. May God, the Supreme Goodness, grant . . . but now I must close; I do close. Adieu, dearest Sir: pray, but fervently and perseveringly; meditate, but as seriously as possible and for the sake of recognizing and embracing the only Truth. An entire and endless eternity is at stake. Adieu, I say, and love just a little in turn me, your most truly loving in the Lord.

ST. PÉ, *of the Society of Jesus.*

Montreal, 15th March, 1751.

The ransom of your people moves on, as I hope, quite to your wish. In this matter, if I can have any influence, I will use it surely, both of my own accord, and on account of your special recommendation.

(To be concluded.)

FATHER PETER DE SMET—MIGHTY SOWER

1801-1873

BY THE REV. JOSEPH M. CORRIGAN, D. D.

(Concluded.)

Finding it impossible because of lack of funds to keep his promise of returning to the Flatheads as soon as he had hoped, Father De Smet, disappointed, but not dismayed, started off in midwinter on a begging expedition to Louisiana and actually collected \$1,100 in New Orleans. Fathers Point and Mengarini and three lay brothers, were appointed to the Mission and set out with Father De Smet on April 24th, 1841. As in the preceding year, the missionaries followed the Nebraska River until reaching the first spurs of the Rocky Mountains. Again dangers by land and water were their daily lot, just escaping at one time a cyclone and shortly afterwards a waterspout. Nearing the source of the great River Platte, the travelers approached the mountains, towering into the clouds. Behind those summits dwelt the tribes destined soon to hear the Word of God.

On the Feast of the Assumption at Fort Hall they met the advance guard of the Flatheads who had traveled over three hundred miles in order to meet the Black Robe. Among them was young Ignatius, Father De Smet's guide of the previous year. Ignatius had been running for four days, without food or drink, in order to be the first to salute the missionaries. Simon, the oldest member of the tribe, was also in the advance guard. Although so worn

with age that even when seated he leaned upon a cane for support, the ardor of his youth revived upon hearing of the approach of the Black Robe. "My children," said he, as he mounted his horse, "I am one of you; if I succumb on the way, our Fathers will know in what cause I died." The seed had surely sprouted with much promise of harvest, and Father De Smet's heart could indeed rejoice when he found that the year's interval had in no way diminished the fervor of the Flatheads. Their reverence, their devotion and their fidelity to the practices he had taught them, seemed continually on the increase. Twice on weekdays, three times on Sundays, during his absence had the tribe assembled to say prayers in common. The box containing vestments, and the altar service left in their charge the preceding year, were carried on high like the Ark of the Covenant each time the camp moved.

Upon his first visit to the Flatheads, Father De Smet had urged upon them to look about for a fertile tract of land where the tribe could settle. His whole efforts now were devoted to teaching the Indians the advantages to be obtained from the cultivation of the soil. They would thus be provided for in the rotation of crops and in their herded cattle, rather than be dependent upon the uncertainty of the chase. The newly-born mission, called St. Mary's, soon became a flourishing Christian colony. Twice a year some of the Flatheads left the village to hunt buffalo. Father Point accompanied the wandering camp, thus preventing the disorders the hunt usually occasioned.

In the spring of 1842 a succession of touching feasts took place. The Rocky Mountains witnessed for the first time the month of May devotions, the celebration of the feast of the Sacred Heart, and the procession of the Blessed Sacrament. The fervor of the Indians was such that numbers were permitted to receive Holy Communion frequently. "There are entire families," writes Father De Smet, "who

approach the holy table every Sunday. Often we hear twenty consecutive confessions without finding matter for absolution." The old Chief Big Face was no longer witness of these wonders. He died during the same winter, after having, at ninety years of age, made his First Communion. "Have you no sins to repent of since your baptism?" asked the missionary. "Sins?" he replied, astounded. "How could I commit sins when it is my duty to teach others to live well?" He was buried wrapped in the flag he waved every Sunday to announce the Lord's Day. He also could chant his *Nunc dimittis*, for he had lived to see his tribe a Christian people, practising, in the heart of the desert, the highest Christian virtues.

Father De Smet left St. Mary's on October 28th, escorted by ten Flathead warriors. On the feast of All Saints he reached the principal camp of the Kalispels, where he was enthusiastically received; and what was his surprise that evening to hear them recite night prayers, and to learn that this tribe was in a way converted before ever having seen a missionary! The mystery was soon solved. Having heard the previous year of the arrival of a Black Robe in the mountains, the Kalispels sent an intelligent young Indian, possessing an excellent memory, to visit the Flatheads. In their camps he learned the prayers, the hymns, and the great truths of the faith, and upon his return was made the apostle of the tribe. His instructions were handed on from one lodge to the other, and before the winter was over, more than half the tribe was Christian. Overjoyed at the admirable attitude of these people, Father De Smet at once baptized the children and the sick of the tribe, and when taking leave of the Kalispels he promised to send a priest who would remain with them.

In June, 1843, Father De Smet again sought aid in men and money from his native land. He visited Rome and was given a brother's welcome by Pope Gregory XVI and

would have been made a bishop if he had not implored his superior to prevent it. Father De Smet and his companions left for America after a six months' stay with nearly \$30,000.

In 1851, Colonel Mitchell, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, held a Council of the Tribes east of the Rockies at Fort Laramie. This gave Father De Smet an occasion to revisit the Sioux and other tribes on the Upper Missouri, and he set out with Father Hoecken on the steamboat "St. Ange".

Three days after leaving St. Louis, cholera broke out on board the "St. Ange", and the merry songs of the passengers were turned into mournful silence. Thirteen persons, one after the other, fell victims to the scourge. Father De Smet was confined to bed by an attack of bilious fever. Father Hoecken, eager to aid others, watched day and night by the bedsides of the dying, administering the consolations of religion, and offering his untiring personal service. "I suffered," writes Father De Smet, "at seeing him labor alone at his heroic task, but I was too weak to assist him in any way. On the 18th, what we thought were symptoms of cholera appeared, and I begged Father Hoecken to hear my confession and give me Extreme Unction. Just at that moment he was called to a deathbed. 'There is no immediate danger for you,' he said; 'we can wait until to-morrow.' That day he assisted at three deaths. I shall never forget the scene that took place a few hours later. Father Hoecken's cabin adjoined mine, and in the early silence, between one and two o'clock in the morning, I heard him call me. I dragged myself to his bedside, to find him in his death-agony. He asked me to hear his confession, which I did, and while I administered Extreme Unction, he replied to all the prayers. His recollection and piety but added to the veneration in which he was held by the passengers. Finding myself in a condition in which I

might die at any moment, I asked him to hear my confession. He was still conscious of what I was saying. With tears streaming down my face, I knelt by the bedside of my faithful friend and sole companion, and to him in his death-agony, I confessed, being myself in an almost dying condition. He soon became speechless. Resigned to God's will I read the prayers for the dying. Ripe for heaven, Father Hoecken rendered his soul to God June 19, 1851, twelve days after his departure from St. Louis."

While going up the river, the burden of his thoughts was the future of these great solitudes. "Nature has been lavish in her gifts to this country, and one need not be a prophet to predict a prosperous future for this land. Before long one could apply to this region the words of the Psalmist: 'The earth was created for the abode of man and to manifest the glory and perfection of the Lord.' These fertile, smiling fields invite the husbandman to till the soil. Ancient oaks await the woodsman; the rocks, the stone-cutter. One day the sound of the axe and hammer will ring through the wilderness. Extensive farms, surrounded by orchards and vineyards, herds and flocks of domestic animals, will cover the uninhabited places, and will provision the towns that shall rise up as by enchantment." But what will then become of the Indian who from time immemorial has possessed the land? A grave and disquieting question to one who had followed the encroaching policy of the States in regard to the red man's territory. "I still keep a ray of hope for the future of these unfortunate tribes," he says. "The Indians willingly send their children to school; they make progress in agriculture and the mechanical arts. It is not too much to hope that they may one day be incorporated into the Union with the rights of citizens. This is their sole chance of salvation. Humanity and justice demand it."

On his return to St. Louis, when reviewing the events

of the five months of his trip, Father De Smet was filled with gratitude to God. He writes: "During my journey across the plains and mountains God watched over me. I escaped from a dangerous malady; from the attacks of the enemy and wild beasts; from small-pox and cholera. I came safely through a camp where men were dying and rotting before me, and remained over a month among the dying and dead, handling and nursing the cholera-stricken victims without contracting the disease. To me was given the happiness of pouring the waters of baptism upon the foreheads of 1,586 children and adults, many of whom have since succumbed to the scourge, and whose eternal happiness is now assured." The missionary's modesty did not permit him to recall the part he had taken in the success of the Conference, but the United States recognized it, and before long it was admitted in Washington that his mediation had been more effective than that of an army. As will be seen, in new conflicts later to occur between the white man and the Indian, he was destined to fill again the rôle of pacificator.

Great as were the difficulties and hardships and soul worries of his missionary work, Father De Smet had experienced nevertheless some joys of his apostolic work most consoling and most gratifying in their nature. That he be purged therefore of the dross of personal gratification, it was necessary that he pass through the refining furnace of misunderstanding and false accusation so severe as to amount to persecution. Father De Smet ardently desired to take up again his mission work. The Indians petitioned him to come to them and the preparations were completed, when a letter arrived from Rome disapproving of his return to the Indians. What had happened? His period of trial had come. Aspersed by men who had been misinformed, his judgment and prudence, nay even his character, were doubted by his superiors. His trials were

many and varied and his extremely sensitive nature caused him hours of bitter discouragement. The specific charges were first that he made fantastic statements which misled and caused bitter disappointment to missionaries following him; secondly, that he was extravagant, especially in giving too generously to the Indians, and in making promises he was unable to keep. Such difficulties, however, are not rare in the history of apostolic work. His superiors came to know the absolutely disinterested character of Father De Smet; and as for his work they were men wise enough to know that, like all work of initiative, it must be tried by the test of time. To-day we know the valiant missionary's right to the glory of having opened a fruitful field to Catholic apostolic work.

The years of progress so fruitful in material prosperity that led up to 1860, had witnessed indeed the almost miraculous growth of the Catholic Church until in that year the Catholics numbered one-seventh of the entire population. This despite the fact that the Know-Nothing agitation had caused a short period of loss, distrust and opposition. Their persecution, however, was the last effort of Puritan bigotry. The storm had tested the roots of the tree of faith and proved them to be buried deep in the hearts of the faithful. The Bishops of the country, recognizing the work of the Jesuits, in 1855 proposed five members of the Society for the episcopate. Father De Smet in announcing this news entreated the Father General to oppose his nomination. His name had been sent to Rome but his sole ambition was to return to the mountains. "The best part of my life," says he, "has been given to the Indians. I have had the happiness of drying tears, dressing wounds, especially wounds of the soul, and directing these poor people in the way of man's true destiny. My robust health has been weakened and my hair has grown gray in their service." At the moment of writing these

lines Providence was preparing for him the great joy of seeing once again, and perhaps saving from ruin, the Christian missions of Oregon.

So inscrutable are the ways of Divine Providence that it was at the call of the Government which had so wronged the Indians that Father De Smet was to receive the opportunity of revisiting his beloved missions. He first accompanied a government expedition against the Mormons and ministered to the Indians through whose country he passed. The discovery of gold, however, had brought the white man again in a new invasion of the West. In defiance of all law they drove out the natives, forcing them to seek refuge in the mountains. There is no darker page in history than the story of the "White Conquest". In exchange for their lands, horses and furs, the whites gave whiskey to the Indians. Drink, being the passion of the race, they eagerly seized upon the fatal liquor. We remember the drunken orgies of the Potawatomies; the same scenes were now enacted in Oregon and California. Men slaughtered each other by the hundreds, and the women and children dragged themselves like animals around their wigwams.

Yet fatal as was the effect of alcohol, its action was too slow to satisfy the invaders. They concluded that the revolver was more expeditious than whiskey, and offered twenty dollars for every Indian scalp. Men killed as a training in marksmanship, and to try their weapons. What value had an Indian's life, when that of the white man was held so lightly? Still more revolting machinations were resorted to. Arsenic was mixed with the flour and sugar sold to the Indians; their springs, from which they obtained drinking water, were poisoned with strychnine, and clothing reeking with infection was given to them. "The following," says a missionary, "was told me by an eye-witness. It happened on the Pacific coast. The whites had decided to destroy an Indian camp, and to accomplish their

fell purpose they hung from a tree in front of the camp the clothing of a man who had just died from small-pox. The Indians, catching sight of the garments, were enchanted, and proceeded to don them at once. Before long this terribly malady appeared, and of several hundred Indians, only a dozen poor wretches remained to weep over the ravages wrought by the disease." If to these destructive causes are added the evils engendered by the immorality of the whites, one readily understands how the Indian population in California fell in ten years from 100,000 to 30,000 souls.

The Indians nevertheless struggled against the invasion of their territory and attempted terrible reprisals. The Federal Government summoned General Harney to put down a general insurrection, and in accepting command of the troops, he asked once more to have Father De Smet appointed Chaplain. After some fighting the Indians were vanquished but not reconciled. The promises of the victors neither dispelled mistrust, nor calmed resentment. The war might at any moment break out again. Father De Smet offered to go alone to spend the winter with the Indians and consolidate the peace, and to return in the spring to give his report to the General. His efforts in behalf of peace were crowned with success, but the journey had been a most difficult one. General Harney lost no time in informing the government of the important services rendered by Father De Smet to the army, attributing to him the good understanding existing between the whites and the Indians. When that year was over, Father De Smet, arriving in St. Louis in the fall, had covered 15,000 miles.

Again Father De Smet had the consolation of a visit to his beloved ones in Belgium. Comforted by his intercourse with them, Father De Smet arrived back in New York in the month of April, 1861, to find his adopted country in the throes of Civil War. During the sad years that fol-

lowed, Father De Smet, several times, was in communication with the far western missions and finally in 1863 again visited the missions in Oregon. His arrival was signaled from one tribe to another by lighting great bonfires on the mountains. The next day he celebrated Mass upon an humble altar decorated with willow branches. This was Father De Smet's last visit. Although the condition of the missions was most satisfactory, he could not put away a presentiment of coming disaster. The work of his life seemed doomed to destruction by the fury and immorality of the pioneer Americans, but whatever became of the Indians they remained ever "the children of his heart". With the approach of autumn, Father De Smet turned his steps homeward. For many long months the Jesuits in St. Louis had had no news of him. "What increases our anxiety," wrote Father Arnould, "is that . . . the crucifix by which the Indians recognized him, which he always wore on his breast, had by mistake been left in St. Louis." When winter came and he did not return, all hope was abandoned and the *suffrages* were said for the repose of his soul. On December 17th, however, after traveling in eight months, 11,400 miles, he suddenly appeared at the University. He returned, however, a broken man, tortured with neuralgia and crippled with rheumatism. However, after some time his health seemed to return slowly and the old missionary, now in his sixty-fourth year, took up active duties again.

Great work was once more to call him. He who had known for twenty years of the gold buried in the mountains, heard of its discovery with great apprehension. The onward rush of the gold-seekers once more brought grievous wrong to an Indian nation, the Sioux, who long before had learned to know and heed and love the voice of Father De Smet. Once again, therefore, he undertook the difficult task of making peace, and on June 9th reached Fort Berthold, near the mouth of the Little Missouri. The news of

the Great Black Robe's arrival reached the Sioux and on July 8th they encamped about three hundred strong on the opposite site of the Missouri. Their presence terrified the whites. But Father De Smet went out alone to meet them, crossed the river in a boat, and was received with lively demonstrations of friendship. The conference lasted three hours. The chief seemed inclined to make peace, and with the Santees, who had been the prime movers in the Minnesota massacre, received favorably the proposals of the United States. Peace might have been made at that time, but General Sully was unfortunately burning to measure his strength with the Indians and his attitude made Father De Smet's mission impossible. Father De Smet returned to St. Louis and communicated with Washington. General Sully was to learn that the words of a Jesuit were more powerful than armed force. A few months later he asked the Black Robe to interfere. But in October of 1864, at the order of the Provincial, Father De Smet returned to Europe. Shortly after he again for the third time declined the honor of the episcopate. Back in America he was allowed to go by boat in 1866 as far as Fort Benton, the post nearest to the mountain missions. He was, however, destined never again to see the Oregon tribes. But in descending the river he stopped several days with the Yanktons, and in the twilight of his years he realized his life's dream, the evangelization of the Missouri tribes, of which this was the last to accept the gospel. A rich harvest was promised; not a single Indian refused to hear the Word of God, not a wigwam remained closed.

New wrongs and unnecessary ravages once more caused the war-cry of the Sioux nation to be heard across the plains. A commission was empowered to deal with the chiefs; it was composed of the most distinguished of the United States army—Generals Sherman, Harney, Sanborn, Terry and Sheridan. It is noteworthy that these men who

had just brought the Civil War to a close, now asked the aid of a missionary to induce a few thousand Indians to lay down their arms. Father De Smet gladly placed his services at the disposal of the Commission, and on March 30, 1868, the missionary left St. Louis, in his 68th year, and in broken health, to embark on the most perilous undertaking of his life. Some tribes, resisting the overtures of peace, refused to join the Council that discussed the terms of peace. Father De Smet, to the admiration of the Indians and soldiers alike, set out with a small escort to seek the enemy's camp, and after an exhausting march of sixteen days he found the Hunkpapas, the Ogallalas and others encamped. The great chief, Four Horns, shared his authority with Black Moon, No Neck, and Sitting Bull. The last-named was soon to become famous. It was this fierce chief who received Father De Smet; he had prepared for him a large lodge in the centre of the camp where a guard of his faithful warriors stood watch night and day.

Worn out by his sixteen days' march, the missionary asked that he might be allowed to rest, and although surrounded by four thousand Indians, sworn enemies of the whites, he tranquilly fell asleep in the full assurance of the good faith of Indian hospitality; until he awakened, his guard kept watch over the venerable white man, wrapped in his Jesuit cloak. When he opened his eyes, the four chiefs were standing before him, and, in the name of his tribe, Sitting Bull addressed him: "Black Robe. I hardly sustain myself beneath the weight of white men's blood I have shed. The whites provoked the war; their injustices, their indignities to our families, the cruel, unheard-of and wholly unprovoked massacre at Fort Lyon (where Covington commanded) of six or seven hundred women, children, and old men, shook all the veins which bind and support me. I rose, tomahawk in hand, and I have done all the hurt to the whites that I could. To-day thou art among

us, and in thy presence my hands fall to the ground as if dead. I will listen to thy good words, and as bad as I have been to the whites just so good am I ready to become towards them."

The Council lasted four hours, and next morning before daybreak Father De Smet set off on his return journey to the fort where the commissioners were anxiously awaiting the result of his interview. The air rang with cries of joy in which the deputies from the Hunkpapas took part. On July 2nd took place the great peace council in which 50,000 Indians were represented. Peace was concluded and Generals and Chiefs, soldiers and Indians, acclaimed Father De Smet the great conciliator whose zeal and ability had brought about the greatest assembly that had been in the Missouri country for half a century.

The last years of Father De Smet's life saw the undoing of much of his best work through a decision of the Federal Government commonly called Grant's Indian Peace Policy. On December 5, 1870, the President informed Congress in a message that "Indian agencies, being civil offices, I determined to give all the agencies to such religious denominations as had heretofore established missionaries among the Indians, and perhaps to some other denominations who would undertake the work on the same terms, i. e., as missionary work." This seemed to be a triumph for faith and civilization. The Catholic Church especially could congratulate itself upon President Grant's rulings, since the greater number of the agencies had been evangelized by its missionaries and it numbered among its neophytes over one hundred thousand Indians. The Protestant sects numbered less than fifteen thousand adherents. Great was the astonishment, therefore, to learn three days later that a Jew had been appointed superintendent of Indian affairs in Oregon. From that instant Catholics knew what to expect from the promises of the Government. As a

matter of fact, instead of forty nominations to which the Catholics were entitled only eight had been accorded to them, the remainder being divided among the different sects, most being given to the Methodists. The superintendent of Indian affairs began the discharge of his new functions by making over the Catholic schools and churches to his Protestant friends, and in the case of the Yakimas forbade Catholic missionaries to enter the reservation. At one stroke 80,000 Indians, without being consulted, found themselves torn from the Church or exposed to apostasy. Thus did the American government repay the services rendered by the Catholic missionaries. The zeal and sacrifice that had won peace and prosperity for the pioneer in the West, until his own violence and rapine brought ruin upon him, were forgotten by a proverbially ungrateful republic. The wave of popularity that carried a capable war general to the president's chair could not give the necessary qualities of statesmanship that would have led him to be, if not broadminded, at least fair. The so-called Peace Policy of President Grant is a blot upon his name and the government he represented.

The Flatheads were the only tribe in the Rocky Mountains that had a Catholic agent. The Nez Percès, a tribe almost exclusively Catholic, were handed over to the Presbyterians. The Catholic agent among the Blackfeet had been replaced by a sectarian as debauched as he was malicious. In Dakota, where the Sioux clamored for Black Robes, all the agencies but two had been given to Protestants. "For thirty years we have labored," wrote Father De Smet to General Parker, Indian Commissioner, on March 27th, 1871, "among the benighted tribes of the far west with only the view of promoting the knowledge of God among them and adding to their temporal welfare. We have divided with them the little means placed at our disposal and often have we joyfully shared their poverty

and privations." General Parker, who owed the success of his office among the Sioux to Father De Smet, allowed this letter to remain unanswered. For the moment the Indians were quiet, so why consider a priest whose services were no longer necessary? But short was the reign of peace. It will be remembered that in 1868 at Fort Rice the United States guaranteed to the Sioux possession of the bad lands to the North. Some years later gold was discovered in the Black Hills and miners overran the country and took complete possession of it. Again and again the Indians appealed to Washington without redress. Then came the revolt of Sitting Bull, and in the valley of the Little Big Horn perished General Custer with seventeen officers and more than 300 soldiers. The bloody death of Custer opened the eyes of legislators to the fact that there was still a force to be reckoned with among Indians who had such leadership as that of Sitting Bull. But Father De Smet was not there to repair the faults and mistakes of the American Government and to bring about peace when the burdens of war were so heavy.

One more visit to Belgium in search of men and money for his beloved missions and Father De Smet's work was done. Growing gradually weaker he abandoned with deepest regret all hope of seeing his missions again. On May 14, 1873, after saying Mass, he remarked to the server, "This is the end. I shall never again ascend the altar." On the 20th he asked for the last sacraments and received them with touching piety and perfect resignation. On May 21st, two days before his death, he said to Archbishop Ryan, then coadjutor of St. Louis, "I have served the good God for many years; I am going to come before him pretty soon, and my heart is very full of confidence and real consolation. I have the greatest hope in the efficacy of the prayers of all to whom the Lord sent me in times past; I count especially on the merits of Jesus Christ, poor

sinner that I am, and I love to think that the Lord will have pity on me in my hour of agony." Up to the last moment he retained full use of his faculties, and he was calm and seemed not to suffer. At a quarter past two on the morning of the feast of the Ascension, May 23, 1873, he rendered up his soul to Him whom he had ardently loved and for whose glory he had labored for fifty years.

This rather full summary of a very full biography has been made to show the absorbing interest of the lifework of this amazing priest and pioneer. His memory is part of our inheritance and as American Catholics it should be our pride, as it is our duty, to keep that memory green and to hold in grateful recollection the story of the trials and hardships so nobly borne by him and others like him who, undaunted and unafraid, dotted their path by plain and prairie and mountain with Catholic altars where later on should gather the Catholic millions of the Republic of the West. Such the harvest one hundredfold, pressed down and shaken together, a bountiful crop of myriad blessings from the seed that was sown by the mighty sower, Peter De Smet, of the Society of Jesus, whose seed was the Word of God!

THE LIFE OF BISHOP CONWELL

BY MARTIN I. J. GRIFFIN

CHAPTER XX—(*Concluded*).

The business affairs of St. Mary's were becoming embarrassed probably either from the defection of some of its supporters, as the great increase in St. Joseph's seems to indicate, or from their growing too cold to furnish financial support to the cause. At a meeting of the Board of Trustees held March 28th, 1824, Hogan's resignation, received from him at Charleston, S. C., was read. The Board directed the Secretary to inform him that though formally accepted this was not thought necessary, as his abandonment of the church in November was a virtual resignation of his rights as pastor.

At the meeting of April 12th the bonds of the corporation were directed to be given to John Leamy, as executor, for his note of \$1000, to John Ashley for \$300, to John Leamy for \$150, to R. W. Meade for \$150, to J. T. Sullivan for \$150, and to Bernard Gallagher for \$150. These sums had been advanced by these gentlemen to satisfy two judgments in favor of Philip Smith and Samuel Parker on which execution had been issued.

On April 20th the annual election for Trustees took place, but without disorder or contest of any kind. At least there is no record of any such. The Bishopites had, as we have seen, abandoned the attempt to get control of the church or to outvote the Hoganite faction, and by allowing their pew rent to get in arrears had forfeited their right to vote. So the Trustees chosen at this election were: John Ashley, John Leamy, R. W. Meade, Bernard Gallagher, Patrick Connell, Arch. Randall and Barry. The Judges of

the election were: C. W. Bazely, Mich. Doran, Amos Hallahan, Alexander Sweeney, Jas. T. Desmond, N. Keough, Timothy Desmond, Francis Duffee, Bartholomew Clare, Arch. Murphy. Two days later O'Meally attended the meeting of Trustees for the first time. He had no doubt "proclaimed" himself pastor of St. Mary's and member of the Board.

On April 26th the suit of the Trustees against Bishop Conwell for the recovery of the vestments, removed from St. Mary's, was settled by John Ashley on the part of the Trustees, and Joseph Snyder on the part of the Bishop. Each side was to pay one half of the expenses of the suit. The letter of Bishop Conwell to his attorney, John Keating directing the giving-up of the vestments is herewith given.

PHILADELPHIA, *Monday Morning, April 26th, 1824.*

DEAR SIR,

I shall interpose no hindrance or objection to the delivery of the articles required by Mr. Ashley into his care and keeping as a deposit for the sake of peace, and to avoid legal alterations, providing that it may be distinctly understood on surrendering them that I admit nothing that can be construed into an acknowledgment of O'Meally's (the excommunicated priest) right of pastorship, or the lawfulness of the proceedings of those by whom he is upheld, which I trust you will arrange with his lawyer.

I remain, Yours Sincerely,

HENRY CONWELL, *Bishop of Philadelphia.*

P. S. Guard also against anything that might imply a renunciation of our legal rights.

To John Keating, Jr., Esq.

The Agreement signed was in this form:

TRUSTEES OF ST. MARY'S CHURCH

vs.

HENRY CONWELL.

This is to certify that all matters in dispute relative to the

vestments and other articles are amicably settled by the subscribers appointed for that purpose, it being agreed that the legal costs attending the above action shall be paid in the following proportion, to wit, one half by the Trustees, the other moiety by Henry Conwell, the defendant. Witness thereof the 26th day of April, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-four.

JOHN ASHLEY,
JOSEPH SNYDER.

April 27th, 1824 Paid Mr. Randall the whole amount of costs, which had been handed me by Mr. Snyder and with him (Mr. Randall) marked the action settled, and costs paid. I received the bonds given by the parties respectively. J. R. I. (J. R. Ingersoll.)

Mr. Keating, the Bishop's counsel in this and other legal contentions, married, shortly after the date mentioned above, the daughter of James Hopkinson. But their union was not destined to be of long duration. Mr. Keating died on July 27th. The general esteem in which he was held is reflected in the newspaper clippings which follow. The *Aurora* said:

In the death of this gentleman Pennsylvania has lost a valuable citizen and the bar a promising member who in the discharge of his duty gained the respect equally of clients, jurors, counsel and judges. . . . This world promised him everything it could promise frail mortality, but the pleasing vision was not to be realized here. The deep regret that his death has occasioned is enough to satisfy the mourner that it will be fulfilled in a world where glory can never fade.

And *The National Gazette*:

OBITUARY

Since the establishment of this gazette, we have had occasion to announce the deaths of many valued acquaintances; but none has occurred more painful to us, and lamentable in itself, than that which we have now to mention. We refer to

the demise of JOHN KEATING, JR., Esq., who expired at one o'clock this morning, in the twenty-sixth year of his age, after an illness of less than a fortnight's duration. It is but a few weeks since Mr. Keating became the son-in-law of Joseph Hopkinson, Esq., and had every reason to promise himself as fortunate a domestic existence and as prosperous a professional career as any person of his time of life. A more remarkable and melancholy instance of the uncertainty of human expectations, and the frustration of the fondest hopes in a numerous circle of relatives and friends, could not be readily cited in the experience of our community.

The deceased was a member of the Philadelphia bar, and had already obtained no inconsiderable practice and reputation. He possessed knowledge, quickness, zeal, industry, elocution, rectitude, and a peculiar suavity and ingenuousness, which recommended him to the highest favour equally of clients, judges and counsel. So complete was his character that he must be deeply regretted by all who had observed it, whether those against whom or on whose side he ever acted in any capacity. As one of the representatives of the city in the legislature at Harrisburg, he acquired universal regard and proved himself worthy of that general confidence in his talents and uprightness to which he owed the station. Though emphatically a studious lawyer, he was conversant with elegant literature, and read with judgment and taste the works of the best authors in several languages. On the whole, it has not been our lot to know an individual more amiable in his domestic relations, more respectable in his public vocation, more anxious to discharge every duty, or more successful in his manly endeavors. The religious education which he received improved his excellent nature. He died as he had uniformly lived, an earnest Christian in the Roman Catholic faith. The pangs of his young and estimable widow may be imagined—they are not to be described.

The Propaganda had recommended, as we have seen, the purchase of ground for the erection of a new church, and for the establishment of a Catholic Cemetery. Al-

though St. Joseph's was enlarged by 27 feet in 1821, it was not well adapted for the Cathedral Church of the Diocese, and still less to the needs of the increasing congregation. Accordingly in April 1824, a lot situated at the corner of Ninth and Walnut Sts., was purchased by Charles Johnson for the Bishop, for the sum of \$40,000. This was destined for the erection of a Cathedral, which needless to say was never erected.

"A very large proportion of the money has been already raised," said Bishop England's paper, *The Catholic Miscellany*, of May 12th.

"The Roman Catholics of this city have purchased a lot of ground for the purpose of erecting a Cathedral. Cost of the ground, 39,600 dollars; estimated cost of the building, 30,000 dollars," said the *Reformer* of May 1st.

Bishop Conwell also mentions the matter in his letters to Marechal.

April 19th. I continued to refuse correspondence until they became Catholics in reality,—they are now divided into parties,—daily fighting,—A lot has been purchased by Catholics to build a Cathedral on it at \$40,000. Those who are engaged for this great sum would be ruined if the Schismatics succeeded in dividing the people, and the cause of Religion would be ruined,—a radical reform can never be effected by mixing with them,—Conwell warns Archbishop against deputations which will be sent to him.

April 26th. He wrote a commendation of Father Harold, "he is indispensable here". Father Cooper is now in Jerusalem, "he is a good man."

Concerning the question of a Cemetery, the following facts are of interest. St. Mary's had possessed a burial ground since 1800. At a Trustee meeting on May 5th, 1800, Messrs. Carrell and Lenahan were appointed to look for a lot for burial purposes. Mr. Lenahan bought at

Public Sale, on May 26th, "two lots on Thirteenth St. for a burial ground", for £149. On June 27th and July 1st of that year, James Pearson surveyed and marked out the lots and charged \$5. Nicholas Esling loaned \$1000 to pay the purchase price of the lot, and to satisfy a claim of Mr. Peacam. The house and lot next to St. Mary's were mortgaged to him as security. Fred Beates drew up the necessary instruments and charged \$3.50 for the mortgage, \$4 for deed of Patrick Lenahan and wife, and \$4 for deed of John Ross and wife. In June three adjoining lots were bought of Elizabeth, widow of Adam Cornman, and in 1806 one other lot was bought from John Ross for £60. These constituted "St. Mary's Burial Ground." At that time they were so far "out of town", and the streets so ill defined that it does not seem to have been clearly known whether it was situated on Twelfth or Thirteenth St. In the minutes of the meeting of Trustees Feb. 12th, 1805 regulations for the new burial ground on Twelfth St. are reported, and on August 17th, 1806 the two new lots purchased are stated to have been on Twelfth St. It is first mentioned as being on Thirteenth St. on April 11th, 1808, when Charles Johnson was directed to have it fenced. Its real position was on Thirteenth St., below Spruce, west side, below Budd St. To the passer-by it seemed to be a portion of the ground of St. Luke's Protestant Episcopal Church, built in 1840, which adjoined it on the south. On the North until a few years ago was a Presbyterian burial ground, upon the site of which houses have now been erected. Sexton Anderson of St. Luke's once said that the inmates of the two burial grounds were "very quiet neighbors. I have passed both places at all hours of the day and night and never heard any religious controversies or disputes. What a happy world it would be if we could all live in peace and quietness like the Roman Catholic and his Protestant neighbor did in those two graveyards. There was never a loud word or growl heard."

This burial ground of St. Mary's was used for interments until comparatively recent years, perhaps as late as 1875. In 1899 the property was sold, and in May of that year the remains of those who had been interred there were removed under the direction of George A. Brennan, undertaker, who gathered the bones found into several burial cases and reinterred them at St. Mary's Cemetery, Tenth, Eleventh and Moore streets, which was bought in 1835. The author was present at the removal. But few of the inscriptions on the old tombstones could be deciphered. The stones also were buried in the newer cemetery. About this time, 1824 Rev. Michael Hurley secured land for a cemetery for the burial of the dead of St. Augustine's Parish. On May 25th 1824 the deed was signed by Andrew Hamilton and wife, ceding a lot of ground 180 feet on Sixteenth St., by 227 feet, 6 inches on St. Andrew, now Wallace St. It was subject to a ground rent of \$180, which was released to the Brothers of the Order of St. Augustine by Henry Beckett, Trustee under the will of Mary Hamilton, by an instrument dated April 17th, 1860. (Sunday Despatch, Nov. 25th, 1883.)

At a meeting on May 19th, 1824, the Trustees received a complaint from the Board of Health concerning the mode of interment in the cemetery on 13th Street below Spruce. Doubtless it was becoming overcrowded. Accordingly Messrs. Keefe and Connell were appointed a committee "to procure a lot suitable for a burial ground." At this time the debts of the corporation of St. Mary's amounted to \$5286.04. At the June meeting the yearly income was estimated at \$3285.33 and the expenses at \$3161. So the sum of \$500 was deducted from the salaries of the pastor and others. The committee selected the plot of ground at the corner of what are now Passyunk and Washington Ave., afterwards called "the Bishop's burial ground", and occupying under that title much space in the records of the Diocese and law courts of Philadelphia. Perhaps they ob-

tained merely an option of some kind on the ground, for it was, by an amicable arrangement transferred to Charles Johnson and Dennis McCready, friends of the Bishop, who in turn deeded it on September 15th to Dr. Conwell. The Deed Book shows the following records:

On December 31st, 1823, by James Paul and wife, to Charles Johnson and wife, the land herewith below described. Consideration, \$1000. (Deed Book, I. H. No. 10, p. 615.)

1824 DEED. Charles Johnson and Catherine his wife.
Sept. 15. and Dennis McCready and Margaret,
his wife,

to

Right Rev. Henry Conwell, D.D.

Con. \$1447.

For a certain lot or piece of ground situate on the North Westerly side of the Passyunk Road, on the North side of Love lane or Prime street, and on the East side of Delaware Eighth street continued in Moyamensing Township, county of Philadelphia; beginning at the corner of land formerly of William Tidmarsh by the side of Passyunk Road and running by the said road South 45 degrees 15 minutes, West about 15 perches and 4/10ths of a perch, more or less, to a corner on the North side of the said Love lane or Prime street, thence along said lane or street North 67 degrees 50 minutes West to a corner on the East side of said eighth street, thence Northerly along said Eighth street to a corner in the land of the said William Tidmarsh and thence along the said line South 68 degrees 30 minutes East to the place of beginning.

Acknowledged September 16, 1824.

Recorded September 17th, 1824.

Deed Book I. H. No. 10, p. 615, &c.

The Bishop, Father McGirr and Father Cummiskey collected sufficient money to reimburse the Trustees and so the legal title became vested in the name of the Right Rev.

Henry Conwell. After his decease, the fact that it had been held in his name became the cause of a long and tedious law suit, his heirs claiming possession of it as his personal property. The Jesuits withstood their demands, claiming that it was held by the Bishop in trust. The testimony was very contradictory. At first the heirs gained some important decisions, but in the end the suit terminated in favor of the Jesuits. Though always known as "the Bishop's Burial Ground" it remained until 1899 in the possession of the Jesuits of Old St. Joseph's. At that time it was transferred to Archbishop Ryan, probably on account of the desire of the Provincial of the order to have the missions divested of all property not pertaining to church or educational work.

A long and interesting letter of the Bishop's to Marechal gives other interesting details of the occurrences of this year. On Oct. 3rd, 1824 he writes that

A small lot of ground about a mile from St. Joseph's has lately been purchased by me for a burying ground at \$1500. This will help to support our persecuted establishment. There are 115 pews in St. Joseph's rented at \$10, \$15 and \$20 yearly. This will enable the clergy to live. The men calling themselves Trustees, with a few Deists and women of abandoned character, their number much declined since Hogan's departure,—the church nearly deserted,—they will have great difficulty in making \$1000 a year for the Apostate Priest.

Oct. 5th. He speaks of the visit of Lafayette to Philadelphia, and the procession in his honor in which Bishop Conwell walked side by side with Bishop White of the Episcopal Church. He sends Address to Lafayette. (Baltimore Archives, Case 15, Letter C.)

Lafayette arrived in Philadelphia on October 1st. On the 2nd he dined with 300 or more Masons. On Sunday, the 3rd he attended at Christ Church where Bishop White officiated. On the 4th the civic parade was held, and in this Bishop White and Bishop Conwell walked together arm in arm to the Navy Yard.

(To be continued.)

HISTORICAL NOTES

BISHOP-ELECT MCDEVITT.

It was with general satisfaction that the news was received that the Right Rev. Mons. Philip R. McDevitt had been elevated to the see of Harrisburg. Monsignor McDevitt has been for many years a member of the American Catholic Historical Society; for two terms he was its president. His membership has always been that of an earnest and enthusiastic worker, especially as a frequent contributor to the pages of these RECORDS. The same capability which has distinguished the Bishop-elect in his nation-known activity in educational circles will serve him well in the new field to which the Holy See has appointed him. To painstaking labor and untiring attention to detail Monsignor McDevitt joins great breadth of view and a grasp of public questions. His work in the episcopate should make the Church better understood and more respected for he has ever believed in Catholics coming forward to take their part in public affairs. The deep religious faith and the unaffected piety which inspire the life of the new Bishop and the kindly sympathy which characterizes all his relations with others give reason to congratulate the diocese of Harrisburg that it has received as its Shepherd not only an ecclesiastic of intellect and ability but one who is universally respected as a model priest and loved as a kind man. The American Catholic Historical Society joins its felicitations to those of the many friends of Monsignor McDevitt in wishing him its heartiest "Ad multos annos".

W. J. L.

O'MEALLY—O'MALLEY.

Dr. Austin O'Malley, of Philadelphia, whose interest and competency in questions of Celtic nomenclature is well known and widely appreciated, writes as follows to the Editor:

PHILADELPHIA, JUNE 19, 1916.

The Editor of the RECORDS A. C. H. S.

Dear Sir:

In the June number of the RECORDS is an account of Father Thadeus J. O'Meally, who is called also O'Malley in Mr. Griffin's *Life of Bishop Conwell*. Bishop Conwell himself in the text of the decree of excommunication calls the man O'Meally. The real name was O'Malley, not O'Meally, which is as different from O'Malley as Smith is. In Irish O'Meally is *ó Mellaig*; O'Malley is *ó Máille*. O'Meally, Melia, O'Mally, Melly, are variants of *ó Mellaig*; O'Malley, O'Mayley, Malia, O'Malia, Mally, are variants of *ó Máille*.

This Thadeus (for Teige, *Tadgh* in Irish) O'Malley belonged to the Limerick Clan O'Malley, an unimportant sept of the Mac Namaras, and they lived in the Tuath Luimhnigh, the district about the City of Limerick. They were in no manner connected with the O'Malleys of Umhall in Mayo, my own Clan. This recurrence of clan and family names without kinship is common in Ireland.

Thady O'Malley of the Hogan Schism was born at Garrytown, near Limerick, in 1796, and died in Dublin in 1877. He was a political writer, an educator, and a journalist, and always "agin the government", whatever the government might be, ecclesiastical or civil. He was a thorn in Cardinal Cullen's side. He wrote a very good book on *Education in Holland*, which has been translated into Dutch. There is a copy of the translation in the New York City Library. Anyone interested in the man will find an account of him in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, London, 1895.

AUSTIN O'MALLEY.

The leading article of this issue of the RECORDS is by Rev. John Lenhart, O.M.Cap., of Wheeling, W. Va. Although entitled "The Capuchins in Acadia and Northern Maine", it might well bear the caption of "A Lost Chapter in the History of Catholic Missions in America". In this somewhat lengthy paper, which will be concluded in the next number of the RECORDS, Father Lenhart has given us a comprehensive, carefully-written and well-documented account of the labors of his brethren in what is now known as "The Land of Evangeline".

Miss Jane Campbell, who has long been actively identified with our Society, has compiled an entertaining account of the owners and inhabitants of the mansion at 715 Spruce St., Philadelphia, which has been the home of the American Catholic Historical Society since 1895. We hope to publish this paper in an early issue of the RECORDS.

RECORDS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOL. XXVII

DECEMBER, 1916

No. 4

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC SUMMER SCHOOL OF AMERICA.

BY THE REV. MORGAN M. SHEEDY, LL. D.

During the months of July and August, this year, the Catholic Summer School of America kept at Cliff-Haven, on Lake Champlain, the Silver Jubilee of its foundation. The writer, who has been closely identified with the institution from the beginning, as its first president and for twenty five years as member of its board of Trustees, proposes in this paper to give a brief history of this Catholic movement.

How; in the limited space of a single article, can one deal at all adequately with the subject? To do so is hardly possible. But, on the other hand, it is hardly necessary, since the main outlines of that history are known to the readers of these pages. What I hope to do is to trace briefly its origin and development; its aims and purposes; to make some reference to the men and women who helped to build it up; what has been done; and what it hopes to do.

Twenty-five years ago at the first session of the Catholic Summer School held in New London, Connecticut, the distinguished preacher of that day, the late Father Pardow,

S. J., proclaimed the purpose of the Catholic Summer School to be the diffusion of light. "Let there be light"—that was to be its chief purpose. Today, looking back over the quarter of a century since those words were spoken, we can well say: "and there was light."

ORIGIN OF THE CATHOLIC SUMMER SCHOOL.

It was a dark afternoon in January, 1892, at 48 Third Avenue, Pittsburg, the most unlikely place in the world, that two Catholic clergymen and a layman met to discuss the project. The layman was Mr. Warren E. Mosher, one of the clergymen, Monsignor Loughlin, of Philadelphia, afterwards the second President, and the writer of this paper, the first President of the School, was the third. "It will never do," declared Dr. Loughlin, "our people will look upon it as a kind of camp-meeting; the bishops will crush it at the start; the thing can't be done; it will strike our people as too strange and novel; better drop it at once." That was rather a gloomy outlook. A little mediation on the subject, however, changed the view of this good priest, who, by the way, was never a pessimist; for within a month from the date of that meeting the following letter was addressed to the *Catholic Review*, of New York City, by the Rev. James F. Loughlin, D. D., of Philadelphia:

"A few weeks ago Mr. W. E. Mosher, the Secretary of the Catholic Reading Circle movement and editor of the *READING CIRCLE REVIEW*, consulted with Father Sheedy and myself as to the feasibility of choosing some desirable place where the Catholic educators of the country and those who are interested in Reading Circles might assemble during the summer vacation and devote some time to the discussion of educational matters, listen to addresses from prominent and experienced teachers, etc. With that characteristic instinct of American Catholicity which immediately 'sits on' everything that looks like a novelty, I

answered bluntly that 'the project is visionary.' 'The time may come,' said I, 'when such schemes may work, but not in the present posture of affairs.' " And he went on to say: " 'I venture to say that ninety-nine out of every hundred Catholics in the world would have treated the proposition precisely as I did, for there are few of us who feel able or willing to 'run a hotel.' And yet, when we take second thought, what is there wild or impracticable about Mr. Mosher's project? There has been an immense and widespread awakening of interest during the past couple of years in the improvement of Catholic pedagogy and the cultivation of Catholic literature. How to perfect our schools, how to interest our young men and women in mental culture, are the questions uppermost in the minds of clergy and laity. Why not hold an informal congress for the discussion of such questions? And what better plan than a general assembly during vacation time? Every Catholic interested either in the improvement of self or of Catholic youth might be invited to attend. A special invitation might be extended to that valuable and most neglected body, the Catholic teachers in the public schools."

From the time of publication of that letter the development of the project was rapid. A meeting of twenty-four or twenty-five prominent clergymen and laymen was held in May 1892, at the Catholic Club, New York City, when it was agreed to hold the first session at New London, Connecticut the following July. That first session lasted three weeks and was a distinct success. The then Bishop McMahon of Hartford gave his hearty approval to the project, and Archbishop Corrigan of New York visited and addressed the assembly. The promoters were greatly encouraged.

The sessions of the second and third years were held in the City of Plattsburg, New York, since the delightful permanent home of the Catholic Summer School was not yet ready to receive its thousands of yearly visitors.

Someone has said: "It has been the struggle of the world to get more leisure," but it has been left for the Catholic Summer School to show how to use it pleasantly and profitably to mind and body.

Sensible Americans must return in the summer season to lives of greater ease, simplicity, and economy. Summer School cottages are more comfortable and more civilized than costly camps in the backwoods, or than noisy, pent-up lodgings in crowded summer hotels. The development of this really simple life, this civilized mode of returning to nature, has only fairly begun in America. We shall see more of it, for

"Life is a game the soul can play
With fewer pieces than men say."

What is the best of all at Cliff-Haven there is healthful open-air life. People spend their leisure outdoors, on lawns and piazzas, in the groves, in friendly walks and talks. There are few things at Cliff-Haven more beautiful and restful than the sight of waving trees, the purple haze enveloping the distant hills, or the soft silvery light of the harvest moon falling on the waters of the lake. Something, it would seem, of the old Greek spirit has here unconsciously reappeared in the free, peripatetic, literary, musical, athletic, out-of-door life of the young people at the Catholic Summer School.

Here on this historic ground, are gathered year after year a multitude of cultivated men and women from all parts of the United States, under the guidance of learned men. They follow broad courses of study, secular, on the whole, rather than doctrinal, but leavened throughout with Catholic truth.

It is impossible, writes a visitor, to watch the enthusiasm which has reigned the whole summer long, in this center of Catholic teaching, and not be convinced that the Summer

School is destined to be the birthplace of a vast new element of strength to the Church which has founded and fostered it. And realizing that, there is a striking significance in the choice of this, of all places on the Continent, as a location for an institution which has such deep meaning and such inherent use.

The historical interest which clings about this particular locality makes it more impressive that the very heart of so famous a neighborhood should become in this wise for a second time the cradle of a great Catholic intellectual and social movement. Here France and England struggled for dominion. Here the military star of France declined with the downfall of Ticonderoga. But the missionaries of the defeated nation won genuine victory on the same ground in the conversion of souls, sealed with the blood of the heroic Jesuit martyrs who fell in the effort to lead the Indians to the light of Faith.

A distinguished visitor directing a friend about to visit the United States, said to him: "Go to Washington, the finest capitol in the world; then to Niagara, the grandest thing in Nature; now, if you want to see one of the most interesting things in the United States, come down the St. Lawrence River to Montreal, and an hour's ride will bring you to the Catholic Summer School, delightfully situated on Lake Champlain. It is a charming spot: pleasant, intellectual people are there in hundreds during the months of July and August; it is one of the most interesting places in the States. Don't fail to see it." And the friend did not. After his visit he repeated the words of the psalmist: "He maketh me lie down in green pastures, He leadeth me beside the still waters."

Once the Catholic Summer School was firmly established it won the approval of the American hierarchy. The great Pope, Leo XIII, who threw open to scholars the Vatican library, with the declaration "Let the truth be known,"

warmly commended its work and mission. Each of the four Apostolic Delegates to this country has visited the School. The three American Cardinals, Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the United States, the Governors of New York, besides many distinguished men in every walk of life have visited the place and gone away delighted with the place and with the work being done at Cliff-Haven.

The life there is ideal. The whole assembly forms one large family, from which obtrusiveness and diffidence are alike absent.

The intellectual features serve to relieve the monotony that usually accompanies life at summer resorts; while on the other hand the social and recreative features take the edge off study, making acceptable and agreeable what otherwise might be laborious and difficult.

The Summer School, then, with its pleasant environment, with its religious advantages, its intellectual work and a social life as far as possible removed from narrowness, is today the ideal Catholic family summer resort, which its promoters hoped and believed it would become.

From the beginning our Catholic women have taken a prominent part in the work of the Summer School. The zest and eagerness with which they welcomed and entered upon its course of study, and the increasing numbers in which they come year after year must have been a surprise to the prophetic vision of its founders, and are sufficient demonstration of its need and adaptation.

Who can estimate what the sense of comradeship and association means to many of those women? They had gone on thinking their own thoughts and bearing their own burdens, regretfully conscious that they were dropping out of sympathy with intellectual life and progress; yet seeing no escape until suddenly a hand reached out to clasp theirs. They were drawn into a magic circle that brought them into fellowship with thousands of others, all listening to the same

truths and pondering the same questions, and they found in the companionship health and strength. Many a lip that had long been conscious of thirst found satisfaction in the fresh draught presented to it; many a soul has been quickened to a new sense of delight by the awakening of dormant powers and the development of unsuspected resources in itself.

It would be well to recall here the names of the men who in the early days did so much for the Catholic Summer School and who have preceded us, "with the seal of Faith and sleep in peace." They bore the burden of the day and made sacrifices that should not be forgotten. Among the laymen were: Warren E. Mosher, the real founder and permanent Secretary up to his untimely death; George Hardy, Dr. John A. Mooney, George Parsons Lathrop, and Malcolm Johnston, both converts to the Faith, and well-known popular writers, the gentle and scholarly Brother Azarias, and three former presidents: Monsignor Loughlin of Philadelphia, Monsignor Denis J. McMahon of New York and Bishop Thomas J. Conaty of Los Angeles, California.

WHAT THE CATHOLIC SUMMER SCHOOL AIMS TO DO.

The chief purpose, as an educational center of the Catholic Summer School of America, is to popularize truth, especially religious truth, as the spirit of evil has popularized falsehood in our day; to prevent the weapons of truth from being turned against truth itself; to rid the mind of the thought that divine faith is an acceptance of doctrines that do violence to our intellect.

The motto of the school: "God is my light," fittingly conveys its aims. It fearlessly proclaims: "Let there be light" in every department of knowledge, in philosophy, science, art, history, social problems, the question of preparedness, of war and peace. We need today the light of Christ, the only true teacher of humanity, in our educational

life, in our social life, in our industrial and charitable work. Our leaders and statesmen need it to guide safely the ship of state amid the troubled waters of our day.

As a great social force the Catholic Summer School of America is using the "cross-hilted sword of Truth to drive the heathen out" of our modern American life. It is, in truth, a center of light radiating all over the land. The purpose of the School is to supplement and complement the work of education, so well cared for in our schools and academies. It serves to repair on the one hand, the injury done by defective education, and on the other to broaden and more generally embellish what was already good. It reaches out to busy men and women and offers them the privilege of special study which will supply for them much which they long for but cannot obtain without great danger to the principles of truth and right action. In this the prospective of the Summer School is that of a quasi university of special knowledge—a peoples' university—to enter which the only requisite is heart and mind seeking greater light and fuller development of truth.

At Cliff-Haven the ablest and best equipped among Catholic leaders of thought, lay or clerical, are brought face to face with a cultured Catholic audience, and give their listeners the fruits of life-long studies in those departments of science or letters in which they have become eminent. They state in single lectures or in courses of lectures such principles and facts and methods as may afterwards be used and applied in one's reading for the detection of error and the discovery of truth. To achieve such work is the high mission of the Catholic Summer School. Its purpose is, in brief, to use the "cross-hilted sword of truth to drive the heathen out of our modern life."

WHAT THE CATHOLIC SUMMER SCHOOL HAS DONE.

It has brought cultivated Catholic people together; it has made us know our own; it has stimulated the reading habit;

it has established and carried on university extension courses in our large cities; it has helped the Catholic press and Catholic literature; it has widened the opportunity for Catholic authors; it has brought into our private and public life the results of the intellectual endeavors of our best scholars, our most profound thinkers, who, under the inspiration of our Holy Faith, have sounded the depths of secular knowledge, and who come with ripe scholarship with which to ornament the education of our schools and homes. We are but the sowers of the idea, reaping, indeed, some of the results; but those who come after us will reap them in the fullness of a ripened harvest. A college city, a university town, will rise up upon the shores of Lake Champlain; halls of science will welcome to their lecture rooms thousands of students, who like the pilgrims of old, will journey thither seeking knowledge. Hospitality will spread its pleasant cheer before all and enjoyment and mirth will make the hours of relaxation pass amid the joys of innocent friendship. Days will come, and learned travelers will delight the student world with the tales of discovery and research. Philosophers and seers with the illumination of faith upon their words, will separate the dross from the gold in the principles of life; and a purer and higher knowledge of God and of themselves will come to the earnest seekers. The warriors of faith, while discoursing of the deeds of old, will prepare the weapons of defence for all to use in the battle of the present; builders of a true life will train mind and heart in the skill necessary for the building of the structure of faith. In a word, the Catholic Summer School of America has a future which may be made a potent factor of our religious and social life as American Catholics, opening to them their place in the great intellectual movement which is destined to bring to our Church and to our people the treasures of mind and heart which truth transmits across the ages as our inheritance.

NOTES ON FATHER NERINCKX'S HYMNARY.

RT. REV. MGR. HUGH T. HENRY, LITT. D.

The list of hymns selected by Father Nerinckx for the Sisters of Loretto, published in the RECORDS for June, 1916, pages 116-119, will perhaps bear a brief comment here.

1. It is gratifying to a lover of the Salve Regina to know that one of its oldest English translations—and in some respects the happiest of any—should have found an abiding home in a Religious Community in the United States, should be so closely associated with the name of the Founder of the Community, and should properly, because of its constant use therein, be styled the "Hymn of a Century." Sister Mary Antonella Hardy, the writer of the highly interesting article, tells us that "throughout the years, copy after copy of words and music has been requested, especially by priests;" that the question was often asked: "Did Father Nerinckx make this translation of the Salve Regina?" and that no other information could be given than that the hymn was affectionately styled "Father Nerinckx's hymn." The full quotation of the hymn in the RECORDS for September, 1915¹ made it clear that Father Nerinckx was not the author; and in the RECORDS for December of the same year² the present writer made grateful acknowledgment to Dr. W. H. Grattan Flood, who had kindly written from his home in Enniscorthy, Ireland, pointing out that the hymn was printed in the *Primer* of 1685.³

¹ See *A Philadelphia Choir Book of 1787*, page 212.

² See *Philadelphia Choir Books of 1791 and 1814*, page 326.

³ Apropos of this, it may be interesting to add that other, but less felicitous, versions had appeared in the *Sarum Primer* of 1538, and in the *Primers* of 1599 and 1615. Seventy years had elapsed between this last-mentioned translation and the classic one of the *Primer* of 1685. It is curious to note that the *Primer* of 1687 thought it desirable to print a prose version (Hail, holy Queen, Mother of Mercy).

The American use of the hymn was frequent in our hymnals of older date, but appears to have ceased entirely in the more recently edited volumes containing hymns, whether issued in America or in the British Isles. I do not wonder that so many requests for copies of the hymn should have been made, under the impression that it was rare. But it seems pitiable that such a beautiful and brief version of the great Anthem of the Blessed Virgin should have been replaced in our hymnals by versified tributes to Our Lady which are very questionable from the standpoint of poetic taste and spiritual unction. The relatively venerable age of the English version might well have served to keep it in loving memory in both prayer-books and hymnals. And here in America it has been associated with our earliest hymnody.⁴ Thanks to such articles as that dealing with this hymn as well as with the collection assigned by Father Nerinckx for the Sisters of Loretto⁵ we may hope to have at some future time a history of American Catholic hymnody which will possess more than a merely historical value.

2. Father Nerinckx's list of hymns comprises more than forty titles. Whence did he derive them? He could have found the English version of the *Salve Regina* in several volumes published in America before the year 1822. It is not necessary, therefore, to suppose that he might have obtained it "from his Reverend brother, John Nerinckx,

⁴ In addition to the *Philadelphia Compilation* of 1787, 1791 and 1814, I find it in the *Roman Catholic Manual or Collection of Prayers, Anthems, Hymns*, published in Boston in 1803; in a volume of *Hymns for the Use of the Catholic Church in the United States of America*, issued at Baltimore in 1807; in a *Collection of Sacred Hymns for the Use of the Catholic Churches in Kentucky*, printed at Bardstown in 1815; in a *Collection of Psalms, Hymns, Anthems, etc.*, published in Washington, D. C., in 1830, and in *A Colleceion of Sacred Hymns* (Louisville, 1853).

⁵ See *Hymn of a Century* by Sister Mary Antonella Hardy in the *RECORDS* for June, 1916, pp. 113-126.

who, an exile from Belgium because of the Revolution, was ordained in London in the year 1802," as Sister Mary Antonella suggests. But what was his source for the remaining hymns? All but three of the hymns in his collection are given in *Hymns for the Use of the Catholic Church in the United States* (Baltimore, 1807). This fact is highly suggestive, but not conclusive; for the title of No. 4 ("Whilst Angels to the world proclaim") is so found in the *Compilation* of 1787, 1791, 1814, but the word "Whilst" is changed to "While" in the 1807 volume of *Hymns*. Of the three hymns I have referred to as not given in the 1807 volume, one (No. 7: "Through all the changing scenes of life") is found in the *Compilation* of 1787, 1791, 1814, and also in the *Manual* (Boston, 1803). I am indebted to Sister M. Antonella Hardy for the information that the remaining two (No. 14: "I hear a charming voice"), No. 28: ("O Mother of the light") are found in *Collection of Sacred Hymns for the Use of the Catholic Churches in Kentucky* (Bardstown, 1815).

3. "Father Nerinckx' injunction that no new songs nor new tunes 'besides those now in use at Loreto' be brought in, was a wise provision against the introduction of non-Catholic words and music. Unconscious he must have been of the certain Protestant authorship of 'Through all the changing scenes of life,' and the same authorship suspected of 'While angels to the world proclaim,' and 'O praise ye the Lord.'" ⁶ There are other hymns in the list besides these, however, which are of Protestant authorship. No. 8 ("Grateful notes and numbers bring") is by the Rev. Wm. Dodd, an Anglican; No. 10 ("Jesus, lover of my soul") is by the Rev. Charles Wesley; No. 18 ("Welcome, sweet day of rest") is by the Rev. Isaac Watts. I merely note these without comment, although much might

⁶ Cf. RECORDS, June, 1916, p. 119 and September, 1915, p. 220.

be said about No. 10 and its use in Catholic hymnals. It is a beautiful hymn—confessedly so by the suffrages of hymnals of all denominations.⁷

4. No. 30 is a translation of the Stabat Mater (“Under the world’s redeeming wood”). The first line, as given in Father Nerinckx’s list,⁸ is thus found in the Boston *Manual* of 1803, in the Baltimore *Hymns* of 1807, and in the Washington *Collection* of 1830. It is a corruption (possibly meant as an emendation) of the true title: “Under the world-redeeming Rood.” This is a version of the Stabat Mater found in the *Primer* of 1687 (as a new rendering of the great Sequence) and in subsequent Primers and Office-books. It is not improbable that Dryden was its author, for his conversion to Catholicity took place in 1686—one year before the translation appeared—and he is known to have translated some of the old Latin hymns of the Divine Office. Certainly the unction, the poetic diction, the powerful rhythms, the close antitheses, of this exquisite poem are worthy of his pen. What could better illustrate all these peculiarities than the third line of the first stanza?

Under the world-redeeming Rood
The most afflicted Mother stood,
Mingling her tears with her Son’s blood.

One may well question the taste of the compilers of present-day prayer-books that could forget such venerable treasures of sacred verse as the translations of the *Salve Regina* and the *Stabat Mater* which the elegant discrimination and the deep and tender piety of Father Nerinckx have so fortunately made part of the hymnal treasury of the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross—at the Foot of the “world-redeeming Rood.”

⁷ Sister Mary Antonella Hardy writes to state that Dr. W. H. Grattan Flood declares No. 13 (“My God, my life, my love”) to be also of Protestant authorship.—EDITOR.

THE CAPUCHINS IN ACADIA AND NORTHERN MAINE (1632-1655)

REV. JOHN LENHART, O. M. CAP.

(Continued)

LABORS AMONG THE INDIANS.

The Capuchins did not restrict their labors to their Abenaki Seminary and to the care of the French settlers. They worked successfully at the conversion and civilization of the Indians throughout the whole extent of their large missionary field. "The soft and religious influence of the Capuchins," remarks Rameau,¹¹⁹ "contributed not a little to the establishment and consolidation of the peaceful relations between the French and the Indians." "The universal fidelity of the Micmacs to the faith of their baptism," writes Father Candide, O. M. Cap.,¹²⁰ "seems to us to be due to a great extent to the influence of the Capuchins. The instruction of the 'Barefooted' Friars, whose memory is still alive among them, must be traced back to the time of the Capuchins. It blended later with that the Recollects who reentered this mission in 1673. The Micmacs still retain the memory of the two kinds of missionaries who had evangelized them: the 'Black Robes' and the 'Barefooters' The latter designation had been a puzzle to them for a long time. They found its solution in 1894 when the Capuchins made their appearance in the Micmac mission at Ristigouche."

Moreover, the spectacle of a staunchly Catholic colony

¹¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

¹²⁰ *Port Royal*, p. 336.

could not fail to exercise a powerful influence on the savages. It would be difficult to exaggerate the attraction exercised by the sight of a religion so generally observed and respected, whose external pomp and ceremonies powerfully appealed to their vivid imagination.¹²¹ The sacrament of Baptism was conferred on North American Indians for the first time in 1610 at Port Royal. In this place the Indian converts were treated as brothers by the French from 1632 to 1654, and the foundations were laid for the future conversion of the entire tribe of the Micmacs.

From the *Relatio* (1656) of Father Ignatius of Paris we learn that "Father Benardin of Crépy converted to the faith many of the dwellers of the district of Pentagoet, or Castine, in the present State of Maine. Brother Elzear of St. Florentin had spent nine or ten years at Pentagoet and had converted several Indians there and taught them the articles of our religion. Father Balthazar of Paris, who knew the Indian language of the district in which he sojourned as well as he knew French, converted more Abenakis than all the other missionaries. He carried on his ministry at Nipiguit with the greatest zeal and success for six complete years. He also ministered throughout nearly the entire district, which covers hundreds of leagues, traversing lands and forests, lakes, seas and rivers, in the course of which he endured incredible privations, hardships, cold and sickness. The result of all this zeal was that he converted to Christ as many as twenty entire families of the Abenakis of that district. I say nothing of the numberless savages throughout Acadia, who, under his ministrations and those of the other missionaries, winged their flight to heaven during the past years. The sheep of the Capuchin missionaries are everywhere scattered throughout Acadia. I have lived eleven years in that Mission and have traversed the entire country

¹²¹ *Candide*, *op. cit.*, p. 336; *Jeron*, p. 293.

of Acadia by land and sea. Father Gabriel of Joinville, in order to master that difficult but beautiful tongue, with its wealth of expressive and idiomatic phraseology, remained for a whole year in the woods alone with the savages, during which time he suffered so severely from privation and destitution of all kinds that, under the stress of his great affliction and suffering, the skin of his body was thrice cast off and changed."¹²²

This is all that can be gleaned from the *Relatio* of Father Ignatius, but these scanty notices do not represent the sum total of the labors of the Capuchins in the Indian missions. Father Ignatius expressly states that he had passed over in silence the results of the labors of the older missionaries, nor did he touch upon all the details of the successful harvest reaped by the later workers in this field. Thus he omits the conversion of *individuals* made by Father Balthazar, and gives only the number of *entire* families of Abenakis who were received into the Church. Father Ignatius could have given us a much more complete report, but he compiled this brief one in haste. He writes at the close of the report: "If the business were not pressing, I would have wished that Fathers Gabriel and Leonard would proceed to Rome to report to Propaganda the wonderful story of the former mission of Acadia." Alas! most of this wonderful story is irrevocably lost.

Some additional information concerning the Capuchin missions is furnished by the Jesuit Charlevoix, who states¹²³ that Druillettes in 1646 found the Capuchins on the Kennebec. Later historians assert that the Capuchins had a hospice there,¹²⁴ but the Jesuit *Relation* of 1647 casts a doubt

¹²² *Relatio*, pp. 333-341 and *passim*.

¹²³ *History of New France*, trans. by J. G. Shea, II, p. 202.

¹²⁴ Shea, *History of the Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the U. S.*, N. Y., 1854, p. 135; Cesinale, III, p. 680; Jeron, p. 295.

on this assertion, according to both Shea¹²⁵ and Campbell.¹²⁶ It seems certain that the Capuchins never had any *permanent* establishment on the Kennebec, but it cannot be denied that the Fathers from Pentagoet (Castine) had labored among the Abenakis living along the banks of that river. They had there established one of those temporary Indian posts with which Acadia was dotted. The whole matter is aptly expressed in the words of James Douglas:¹²⁷ "The Algonquin tribes settled along the frontier of New England had already received in 1646 the rudiments of Christianity from some Capuchin monks who were dwelling among them and who had established a mission on the headwaters of the Kennebec."

When the Indians set out in the autumn on their winter hunt, the barefooted Capuchin invariably followed them into the "forest primeval." There he lived with them the Indian life of privation and austerity; there he ministered to the spiritual wants of his red children; there he continued his missionary work among the still heathen Indians. During the summer months the Indians lived nearer the settlements.¹²⁸ In this way is explained the fact that the Capuchins had many temporary mission posts in the Acadian forests and also how missionaries like Father Ignatius "traversed the whole country by land and sea."

A DISAGREEABLE INCIDENT.

Until 1647 no mention is made in the Jesuit *Relations* of the silent work of the Capuchins in Acadia. In that year a disagreeable incident is related. Some Abenakis from the Kennebec, while on a visit to the friendly Catholic Indians

¹²⁵ *Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, p. 236, note 4.

¹²⁶ *Pioneer Priests*, III, p. 76.

¹²⁷ *Old France in the New World*, Cleveland, 1905, pp. 288-303.

¹²⁸ *Candide, Port Royal*, p. 335; Jeron, p. 293.

of Sillery, were converted by the Jesuits. On their return home they preached the faith to their fellow tribesmen with the result that the Abenakis in 1646 sent to Quebec for a missionary. The Jesuit Father Druillettes was appointed to the new mission and, leaving Sillery with a party of Indians, 29 August, 1646, he followed the "Kennebec Road" to the banks of the Kennebec River. He left the St. Lawrence River a short distance below Quebec, and entered the Chaudière River, then portaged over to the Moose River and finally reached the Kennebec. He was the first white man to use this road from Quebec to Acadia, though it had been travelled in the opposite direction as early as 1630 by three Recollects. Druillettes followed the Kennebec to the sea, and then skirted the coast in his canoe to the Penobscot. At Fort Pentagoet, now Castine, he was kindly received by Father Ignatius of Paris, the Superior of a small convent of Capuchins. Early in the following summer ¹²⁹ Druillettes returned to Quebec, arriving there 15 June, 1647.

Soon after, 3 or 4 July, 1647, a letter arrived from the Capuchins asking that the Jesuits should not return to the Abenakis. The Superior of the Jesuit Missions in Canada at once relinquished the field specially assigned to the Capuchins. In 1647 and 1648 the Abenakis asked for the return of Father Druillettes, but their petition was refused.¹³⁰ Father Campbell ¹³¹ thus comments on this unpleasant occurrence: "What makes this opposition of the Friars particularly regrettable is that, according to Shea in his *Catholic Missions*, they never attempted any work among the

¹²⁹ Parkman, *Jesuits*, pp. 321-323; Rameau, pp. 115, 119; Campbell, pp. 74-79; Rochemonteix, I, pp. 270-272; Shea, *Catholic Missions*, pp. 136-138; *Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, pp. 238-239; O'Gorman, p. 131.

¹³⁰ Shea, *Catholic Church*, pp. 239-240; Campbell, p. 80.

¹³¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 80.

Indians. They were merely chaplains to the French. . . . Indeed, their attitude was so unreasonable that, after some hesitation, it was decided to disregard it. . . . In July 1648, it was determined that, if the Abenakis asked again for the Father, he was to be sent."

It is true that Shea in 1854 in his *Catholic Missions* (p. 135) wrote: "We are not aware that they (the Capuchins) ever attempted any Indian missions." He had found nothing in his Jesuit sources. But thirty-two years later, after studying Moreau, the *Collection de Manuscrits*, and some unpublished documents, the same author in his *Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (p. 236) wrote: "The conversion of the Indians was one of the main objects of the mission" of the Capuchins in Acadia. In 1895 the Rt. Rev. Thomas O'Gorman justly observed:¹³² "The fact that Richelieu gave them (the Capuchins) in 1640 means to found and maintain an Indian school proves that they were active in the work of converting the tribes." To-day we are acquainted with some interesting details of their Indian missions.

We do not know why the Capuchins objected to the Jesuit mission on the Kennebec. All our information concerning this event is derived from Jesuit sources, for Father Ignatius, who some years later (1653 and 1656) compiled some notes about the Acadian mission, is silent on this matter. It may be that Father Ignatius, in view of the fact that the Capuchins had been teaching the rudiments of Christianity to the Abenakis long before Druillettes descended the Kennebec, did not see the necessity for establishing a new mission. There must have been weighty motives for the action of the Capuchins, for they were not of a combative mood, else they would have asserted their

¹³² *History of the Roman Catholic Church in the U. S.*, N. Y., 1895, pp. 130-131.

rights at an earlier date. For ten years prior to 1647 the Jesuits had been overrunning the territory of the Capuchins, to whom they were under obligations when they were reinstated in the Canadian missions in 1632. In 1634 the Jesuit Perrault began his labors on Cape Breton, and in 1635 two Jesuits established themselves on the little island of Miscou to minister to the small number of Frenchmen occupying that post. From Miscou they extended their missionary circuits to Richibucto, Miramichi, Nipisiguit, and as far down as Cape Breton and Chedabucto (now Guysborough) in Nova Scotia and spread over the whole coast from Chaleurs Bay to Cape Breton.¹³³ Now all this territory belonged to Acadia. D'Aunay, the Governor of Acadia, had established *habitations* on Miscou and Cape Breton. Father Ignatius in 1656 describes the Capuchin mission in Acadia as "comprising that whole district which begins on the south side with Cape Malabar (Massachusetts), and is bounded on the north by the harbor of Gaspé."¹³⁴ The Jesuit missionary descending to Nipisiguit found a Capuchin stationed on "these northern borders of Acadia" (Father Ignatius), and, pursuing his southward course to Chedabucto, he landed a short distance from the Capuchin monastery at Cape Canso. Nevertheless we do not hear of a single instance where the Capuchins objected to these infringements. They worked in harmony with the Jesuits and the harvest of souls was abundant. The result of the labors of the Jesuits on the whole coast from Cape Breton to the Bay of Gaspé are thus tersely described by the Jesuit De Rochemonteix:¹³⁵ "They marked their passing by a goodly number of children baptized in danger of death and the conversion of some adults." These were the chief

¹³³ Rochemonteix, I, p. 198; Campbell, III, p. 21.

¹³⁴ *Relatio, edit. cit.*, pp. 333, 337.

¹³⁵ *Op. cit.*, I, p. 198.

results of their efforts during thirty years (1634-1664), according to Fernet.¹³⁶ In 1664 the Recollects again took charge of Acadia and Gaspé and the Jesuits returned to the St Lawrence.¹³⁷

In the light of these facts the opposition of the Capuchins to the establishment of a Jesuit mission on the southern borders of Acadia may not have been "so unreasonable" as Father Campbell judges it to have been. The Jesuits determined to disregard the protest of the Capuchins, July 1648. A few months later they could have sent Father Druillettes to the Abenakis without danger of giving umbrage to the Capuchins, for the new Superior of Pentagoet, Father Cosmas of Mantes, while visiting the missions of Canada and Sillery in company with Father Gabriel of Joinville, in the fall of that year granted the petition of the Abenakis for the return of their Patriarch Druillettes. He even addressed a touching letter to the Jesuit Superior begging him to reopen the Abenaki mission. Although this letter is dated 1648, Father Druillettes did not set out for the Kennebec until the last day of August, 1650. In March, 1652, he was back at Quebec, and for some years subsequently the mission was without a priest. The Society of Jesus found it impossible to fill the post on the Kennebec.¹³⁸

The baptismal Records of the Indian mission at Sillery furnish a few additional facts concerning the Capuchin Indian missions. There are two entries of Indian children baptized by the Capuchin Father Cosmas of Mantes on the St. John River on 10 May, 1648, and on both occasions Charles D'Aunay, the Governor of Acadia, acted as sponsor. As these children belonged to the Jesuit mission Father

¹³⁶ In *Catholic Encyclopedia*, III, p. 232.

¹³⁷ Shea, in *Winsor*, IV, pp. 267-268; Rochemonteix, I, p. 199.

¹³⁸ Campbell, *op. cit.*, pp. 82-100; Shea, *Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, pp. 240-242; Parkman, *Jesuits*, pp. 323-330.

Cosmas gave them baptismal certificates ¹³⁹ which, on their return, they handed to the Jesuit Superior at Sillery, Father Le Jeune, who entered them on the mission Records, 9 July and 2 August of the same year. Father Candide, O. M. Cap., is of the opinion that "these neophytes were Algonquins or Maliseets, subjects of the Jesuits, whom the Capuchins baptized on this occasion, and most probably children of residents of Sillery who were out on a hunting or fishing tour." ¹⁴⁰

LIFE AT PORT ROYAL MISSION.

By a decree of Cardinal Richelieu the Indian converts, without taking out naturalization papers, ¹⁴¹ were accorded equal political privileges with native Frenchmen both in Canada and in France. In the fief of Port Royal this system was a great success. Rameau can hardly find adequate words to portray the happy life of the flock over which the Capuchins watched at Port Royal. "On Sundays," he

¹³⁹ I append here these two extracts from the baptismal records of Sillery:

"Anno Dni 1648 Julii 9 mihi Paulo le Jeune Soc. J. Sacerdoti redditum est testimonium quo significabat R. P. Cosmas de mante Capucinus a se baptizatum esse in Acadia ad flumen Sti. Joannis n. infantem ex patre Maksus nondun christiano et Jaquilina . . . patrinus fuit D. Carolus . . . Acadiae moderator; nomen infanti Carolum dedit die 10 maii 1648 quo baptizatus est infans aliquot mensibus natus.

"Anno Dni 1648 Augusti 2, mihi Paulo le Jeune Societatis Jesu Sacerdoti redditum est testimonium quo significabat R. P. Cosmas de mante superior missionum Capucinatorum in Acadia a se baptizatum esse ad flumen Sti. Joannis n. infantem quattuor circiter mensibus natum ex patre Bernardo Mitgeminitik et matre Francisca Sksinteganig. Patrinus fuit D. Carolus . . . Acadiae moderator, nomen Francisca infanti datum est, die 10 maii 1648 baptizata est."

These two entries represent all of the baptismal registers that escaped the ravages of time. I am indebted to Father Pacifique, O.M.Cap., for a copy of these records. The Church Registers of the Acadian Mission of the Capuchins have perished.

¹⁴⁰ Letter to Father Pacifique, O.M.Cap.

¹⁴¹ *Collection*, I, p. 70.

writes,¹⁴² "the simple Acadian farmers were soon issuing from every recess of the charming valley of Port Royal. Some came in canoes down the Annapolis River, some rode on horseback over the Acadian plains. In winter snowshoes had to take the place of the oar and the saddle. Long lines of Micmacs, covered with odd ornaments and glaring paint were everywhere met, likewise, on their way to church. D'Aunay had reserved for common use an extensive tract of land and meadow around his manor and the church. This was called the *Common Grounds*. There the newcomers tied their animals and put down their baggage. These grounds served as pasture when the animals could not be driven into the country on account of bad weather. At other times the peasants used them as a temporary meeting-place. But it was planned that, in future years, these Common Grounds should be covered by public buildings, such as schools, churches, market-houses and stores. The pious Seigneur left his manor in due time to his wife and numerous children. The Capuchins in charge of the Indian seminary would shortly meet then. Their Indian *pensionnaires* and their day-scholars arrived to take their places in the church. This edifice stood on the site of the present Anglican church at Annapolis. Close by is the cemetery where the English now repose among the remains of those Acadians. The church at Port Royal in 1650 was very plain. It was a log-building, spacious and massive. Parasites had already commenced to creep about this lonely house of God. Its interior was rustic in appearance and was decorated appropriately with flowers and foliage. Few ornaments were found there, but much sincere piety and deep-rooted faith. All joined in the singing, and the combined voices, though less harmonious individually, always

¹⁴² *Une colonie féodale*, pp. 99-101, 138, 140, 150-151. Cf. *Candide*, *Port Royal*, pp. 336-338; Jeron, p. 294.

produced a grand impression by their solemn intonations. The ceremonies were impressive, touching, and full of unction, for these people were Christians indeed. The French, as well as the savages, frequented the sacraments, the Seigneur and his family setting the best example. Everybody took part in these religious exercises with heart and soul. These Acadian farmers left their dear old church more recollected, better disposed, more resolved to perform their work, to sustain the privations, and to endure at times the disappointments of the hard and solitary life led by that little band of Frenchmen who were completely shut off from the rest of the world."

In fair weather the Acadian farmers tarried on the Common Grounds after divine service, telling about their clearings, their crops, their hunts, about the latest enterprises of the Seigneur, and about the countless little happenings of their private lives, just as they used to gossip in Old France. There they arranged the amusements and frolics which broke the monotony of their life. There, "at the joyous feast of the Patron Saint," "Evangeline danced with Gabriel." There some smaller parties drew nearer each other in closer friendship. At last these groups disbanded with humorous pleasantries and loud laughter; for wherever ten Frenchmen meet, there is always a jester to amuse the other nine, a "Benedict Bellefontaine who has ever his jest and his ballad."

The Seigneur D'Aunay mixed with his gossiping tenants. He told his adventures on land and sea, his roving in the forest primeval. Old troopers recounted their checkered career in that strange country. The venerable Micmac *sagamos* participated sometimes in these conversations, for they were all great story-tellers and very much enjoyed a hearty laugh. The Micmacs were so cheerful and communicative that they soon became intimate with the French, and associated to their heart's content with their Acadian

neighbors. Their social intercourse often became so unrestrained that the Acadians sometimes complained about their inconvenient friends and their good-humored importunities. Nevertheless, the French on their part became attached to this good-natured people. The Acadians obstinately refused to wage war on their former allies when Acadia had been conquered by the English. "We have lived together," they said, "we have prayed together, we have shared common dangers; they are our brothers: we will never attack them."¹⁴³

Acadia during the later part of D'Aunay's administration knew years of bliss and peace. Then indeed Acadia was "the home of the happy."

FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE MISSIONS.

The funds of the Capuchin mission in Acadia were comparatively meagre. The poor Capuchins had no large sums at their disposal to carry on their missionary work. In this respect they could not compare with the Canadian Jesuits, who were financially better situated.

The Capuchin missions in Acadia were first supported by the *Company of One Hundred Associates*. In January, 1635, a separate company was organized for the colonization of Acadia exclusively. Cardinal Richelieu contributed, January 16, 1635, the sum of 17,000 livres to this newly constituted *Company of New France* and was allotted a fifth part of its property. The Governor of Acadia, Isaac Razilly, was another of the five shareholders. This company maintained the colony in general and the missions in particular. A notable change took place in 1640. In January 1640 Cardinal Richelieu transferred his share to the Capuchins for the support of the missionaries and the maintenance of their Indian seminary. On January 13,

¹⁴³ Ferland. *Cours d'Hist. du Canada*, I. Quebec 1861, pp. 71-72.

1640, the merchant Pierre Briant of Paris was appointed administrator of the revenues of this share, for the Capuchins were forbidden by their Rule to conduct commercial enterprises. The capital stock of the company, one hundred and two thousand livres, was divided into six shares of 17,000 livres each. On February 27, 1641, D'Aunay was rewarded with the seventh share in recognition of his signal services.

Pierre Briant could not well administer the business affairs of the Capuchins on account of the great distance, and was succeeded, February, 1642, by D'Aunay, who accepted this charge, as he states in the document drawn up under that date, "with pleasure, because it concerned the advancement of God's glory in New France and he promised to do his best that these people might better advance according to the intention of His Eminence Cardinal Richelieu."¹⁴⁴

The fact that Cardinal Richelieu in 1640 endowed the Indian school at Port Royal proves, as Shea (l. c.) remarks, "that the great Cardinal of France was actively interested in the Christian education of New England Indians long before Plymouth, or Massachusetts Bay, or the British ruler had paid any attention to it."

The Jesuits in Canada had ampler funds at their disposal. A list of their benefactors reveals the fact that the Canadian mission received 110,000 livres from 1634 to 1655. In addition to this amount the mission had an annual revenue of 4,700 livres,¹⁴⁵ derived from the donations of the rich and noble. The Government, moreover, contributed to the maintenance of the missions. On March 27, 1647 the French king enacted that 5,000 livres should be paid every

¹⁴⁴ Moreau, pp. 137-139, 164-165, 168; Rameau, p. 96; Shea, *Church in Colonial Days*, pp. 236-237; O'Gorman, p. 130. Cf. Parkman, *Jesuits*, pp. 158-159, for comments on the MS. report of Pierre Briant's administration of the Capuchin funds.

¹⁴⁵ Shea, *Catholic Missions*, p. 125.

year to the Jesuit missionaries in Canada. Since this sum was insufficient the king granted them in July 1651 some fishing franchises.¹⁴⁶

Compared with these funds of the Canadian missions the endowments of the Acadian missions must be regarded as rather poor. The French Government never expended a "sou" for Acadia. Neither the colony nor the Capuchin missions ever received a State subvention. The little money accruing from their share and some small donations from the Company of New France and D'Aunay was their whole income. In February 1647 the King himself states that the entire colony, the Indian Seminary, and the Capuchin missions were maintained by D'Aunay and that nobody else ever contributed anything to them.¹⁴⁷

The Capuchin fund for maintaining the Indian Seminary formed a separate foundation. Its interests were kept entirely distinct from those of D'Aunay. The seminary of Port Royal with its landed estates was a separate corporation.¹⁴⁸ In 1656 Father Ignatius of Paris thought the income of Richelieu's fund, together with a donation of 200 or 300 crowns, would suffice to re-establish the Acadian missions.¹⁴⁹

Cardinal Richelieu was not the only benefactor of the Capuchin missions in Acadia. The historian of these missions cannot pass over in silence the benefactions of the two Governors Isaac Razilly and D'Aunay. The former gave of his private means money for the maintenance of the colony and the missions.¹⁵⁰

D'Aunay was the greatest benefactor of the Acadian

¹⁴⁶ *Collection*, I, 130-131; *Rochemonteix*, I, 470-472.

¹⁴⁷ Moreau, 243.

¹⁴⁸ Rameau, 89.

¹⁴⁹ *Relation*, pp. 335, 340.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Moreau, pp. 135-137.

missions. Like Razilly, he was at the same time Governor, royal lieutenant, manager of a company, and owner of a large private estate.¹⁵¹ By the year 1645 D'Aunay had advanced 500,000 livres for the development of Acadia. A considerable sum was paid by him for the maintenance and advancement of the Capuchin missions. Whenever the revenues of the Capuchin mission ebbed low, D'Aunay defrayed the necessary expenses from the Company's revenues or from his private resources. The interests of the mission and his private interest were one and the same. He contracted heavy personal debts in his own and the mission's interests. That the Abenaki Seminary at Port Royal could thrive for so long a time, is mainly due to his extraordinary efforts. He saved it from utter ruin in 1643. Hence, D'Aunay's death in 1650, was an irreparable loss for the Acadian mission. Five years later it was completely ruined. The Capuchins showed their gratitude towards their generous benefactor even after his death. On August 6, 1653, Father Ignatius penned his eloquent vindication of D'Aunay's character. Later the Capuchins assisted D'Aunay's children to win their lawsuit against Le Borgne (1657), thereby recovering their fortune.¹⁵²

The *Company of New France* contributed considerably to the maintenance of the Mission. Its members cannot be passed over in silence when speaking of the benefactors of that pious work. From 1641 to 1654 the *Company of New France* was composed of Claude Razilly, Nicolas le Tardif, the Capuchins, and D'Aunay.¹⁵³ Razilly and Tardif, therefore, must be entered on the list of benefactors of the Capuchin mission.

¹⁵¹ Moreau, 272; Rameau, 71, 77, 96-97, 110.

¹⁵² Moreau, 266; Collection, I, 136-140, 151.

¹⁵³ Moreau, 164.

THE FATE OF THE MISSION.

The Acadian mission came to a tragic end in 1654 and 1655. No sooner had D'Aunay paid the debt to nature, than confusion commenced to reign in his *habitations*. In 1653 Le Borgne landed in Acadia to collect his debts by force. The preceding year his emissaries had gained possession of the fief of Port Royal. This was not the last act of injustice committed by these usurpers. Le Borgne was a Catholic, but yet he did not scruple to persecute his co-religionists. "He banished from Port Royal the two Capuchins, Fathers Cosmas of Mantes and Gabriel of Joinville, together with Madame de Brice, the Directress of the Indian Seminary, and detained them as prisoners in his ships for five whole months. Becoming aware of this, the other Capuchin missionaries, who were at that time at Port Royal, withdrew from that place, being unwilling to hold any communication with those impious and sacrilegious Christians."¹⁵⁴ They made their abode with the Indians in the neighboring woods awaiting more auspicious times.

In the fall Le Borgne returned to France, and the Capuchins re-entered Port Royal, re-opened their seminaries, and set about rebuilding their church at Port Royal. The old monastery had been replaced by a spacious edifice.¹⁵⁵

The bright hopes of this new beginning were soon blighted. Le Borgne re-appeared on the scene in 1654. His success of the preceding year had aroused his ambition. Aspiring to the mastery of all Acadia, he landed first at Cape Breton to overtake Denys. The settlements of this old trader were seized and Denys was carried off captive to Port Royal. La Hève was next sacked and looted. The fortress and all the neighboring houses were consigned to the flames. The Catholic Church of La Hève shared a similar fate.

¹⁵⁴ Ignat. of Paris, *Relation of 1656*, ed. cit., pp. 336, 340-341; Jeron, p. 296; Candide, *Port Royal*, p. 338-339; *Silhouettes*, pp. 319-320.

¹⁵⁵ *Collection*, I, 146, 148.

Le Borgne gave orders to set fire to it and within three or four hours it was reduced to ashes. Le Borgne next led his mercenary force to Fort Saint John to attack Latour. Some soldiers had already taken positions when an untoward event caused Le Borgne to desist from his project. He proceeded to Port Royal expecting more propitious times. Meanwhile another formidable foe had made his appearance in Acadia, the English.¹⁵⁶

In accordance with secret instructions from Cromwell, an English force subjugated the whole of Acadia in 1654. Latour was easily disposed of; he surrendered without making any resistance. The English then attacked Port Royal where Le Borgne made an unsuccessful stand against them, but was soon compelled to surrender. Fort Penta-goet had been taken previously, but we do not know anything definite about this event.¹⁵⁷

Thus the three principal settlements of Acadia were occupied by the English in 1654. The colonies, which D'Aunay had developed, maintained and protected during the fourteen years of his administration, were captured by the English just four years after his tragic death. Father Ignatius of Paris lays the whole blame for this unfortunate turn of events on Le Borgne. "It is he (Le Borgne)," he writes in his *Relation*,¹⁵⁸ "who is the cause of the ruin of the Faith in these parts and of the capture by the heretics of three settlements, inasmuch as it was he who, by his intrigues, prevented the powerful ruler of France from assuming, together with the sons of the late Viceroy (D'Aunay), the government of all Acadia, which under so distinguished a ruler would certainly never have fallen into the hands of these heretics."

¹⁵⁶ Moreau, 261; Rameau, 109; Ferland, I, 495-496; *Candide, Silhouettes*, p. 319-320.

¹⁵⁷ Moreau, 262-263; Rameau, 109; Ferland, I, 496; Winsor, IV, 145; Jeron, p. 296.

¹⁵⁸ *Edit. cit.*, pp. 336, 340.

The Acadian Mission was practically ended by the conquest of the English in 1654. Yet in Fort St. Peter at Cape Canso the Capuchins remained till the following year (1655). Some Capuchins still continued to labor in Acadia after 1655. But these missionaries carried on their work single-handed. All their regular houses were broken up. The year 1655 marks therefore, the date of the actual expiration of the Acadian Capuchin Mission.¹⁵⁹

Regarding the termination of this mission Shea makes some mistakes. "Foreboding apparently the close of their mission," he writes,¹⁶⁰ "amid these distracting scenes (i. e. the struggle between Latour and D'Aunay), Father Cosmas visited Canada in 1648 . . . and addressed the Jesuit Superior, begging him to renew the Abenaki mission." This struggle had been brought to an end in 1645. In 1648 the outlook for the colony and the mission was bright. The time of gloomy forebodings had passed.

Quite as unfounded as this statement is another of Shea: "Before the second mission of Druillettes among the Abenakis in 1650," he writes,¹⁶¹ "the Capuchins had been carried off by De la Tour." Father Campbell makes the same assertion.¹⁶² Latour never carried off any Capuchins. From 1645 till 1650 neither Latour nor any Puritan dared to set foot on Acadian soil. The valiant Sieur D'Aunay warded off every foe. It was a year after D'Aunay's death before Latour ventured to return to Acadia. The Puritans of Massachusetts Bay were afraid of D'Aunay who repeatedly had shown them his strong hand. They were only too glad to sign, in 1646, a treaty of peace with this intrepid Frenchman. The confusion following D'Aunay's death and the the speedy ruin of his colony bring out in strong relief the

¹⁵⁹ *Relation* of Ignatius of Paris, *passim*.

¹⁶⁰ *Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, p. 240.

¹⁶¹ *Hist. of Cath. Missions*, p. 138, note.

¹⁶² *Pioneer Priests*, III, p. 80.

part he played in shaping the destinies of his people. If death had not cut short his career, the history of Acadia would not record so many tragic events.¹⁸³

One more erroneous statement of Shea¹⁸⁴ needs correction. He writes: "In 1655 Bernardine de Crespy, the missionary at Pentagoet, was carried off to England." This sad incident occurred in 1654, and not in 1655. The Relation of Father Ignatius of Paris is very explicit about this matter.¹⁸⁵

The English conquest was the doom of the Capuchin missions. The French garrison at Port Royal did not surrender unconditionally. The articles of the "Capitulation du Port Royal" of August 16, 1654, which were arranged between the French and English commanders, guaranteed certain rights to the inhabitants passing under English rule. The settlers of Port Royal and vicinity were granted liberty of conscience and free exercise of religion. In case they should decide to return to France they were to be provided with both vessels and provisions. The Capuchin missionaries were to enjoy the same privilege, should they prefer to leave the country. Choosing, however, to remain in Acadia, they would be at liberty to do so, provided they withdrew two or three miles from the fortress. But this permission was qualified by the clause, that it should last so long as His Highness Oliver (Cromwell) would see fit.¹⁸⁶

The emissaries of Cromwell had as little respect for liberty of conscience as the great Lord Protector. "From Port Royal," Father Ignatius informs us,¹⁸⁷ "they sent

¹⁸³ Moreau, 258, 264; Rameau, 107; Ferland, I, 351-355, 495; Bourinot, p. 105. Candide, *Port Royal*, p. 331-332.

¹⁸⁴ *Cath. Church.* p. 243.

¹⁸⁵ *Edit. cit.*, p. 333, 337.

¹⁸⁶ Text of the *Capitulation* is printed in *Collection*, I, 145-149. Cf. Ferland, I, 496.

¹⁸⁷ *Relation of 1656, ed. cit.*, p. 333-334, 337-338.

away all the soldiers and sailors, allowing only the widow and the children of D'Aunay and all the French, who had for several years been settled on the lands near by, to remain among them. These, however, they deprived of all spiritual succour, by banishing Father Ivo of Paris together with two Brothers, John of Troyes and Francis Mary of Paris, and by putting to death Father Leonard of Chartres, the Superior of the Mission. In Fort Pentagoet and Fort Saint John they left no French, except one or two unfaithful Catholics; the rest they sent back to France together with their Capuchin missionaries. There remained only two Missionaries in Acadia, after August 16, 1654. The first of these two Capuchin Fathers, Balthazar of Paris, was stationed at Nepigiguit, now Bathurst, N. B., He, soon after, went to France to report the sad state of the Acadian Mission. Early in 1656 he returned to Acadia. The second Missionary, Father Augustin of Pontoise, remained at Fort St. Peter on Cape Canso, with the Brothers, Felix of Rheims and Elzear of St. Florentin. But in 1655 they were compelled, under stress of destitution, to return to France." The last Capuchin hospice in the Acadian forests was abandoned, and all the Capuchins but one departed from New France.

ACADIA UNDER ENGLISH RULE.

The authority of the English Governor of Acadia hardly extended beyond the walls of the three forts of Port Royal, Pentagoet, and St. John. The French settlers continued to live on their farms. The *Company of New France* continued to grant concessions of land to new colonists. Denys, like other traders, was not disturbed in the least on Cape Breton. Acadia still remained French and Catholic. On Aug. 9, 1656 Cromwell granted to Latour, Thomas Temple, and Will Crown that part of Acadia which extends from Mirligaiche Bay to Fort Pentagoet. It is worthy of notice

that there is a clause in this Patent which provides that no one is to reside in the colony but Protestants.¹⁶⁸

The history of Acadia from 1654 to 1667 is to a great extent a blank. We hear of only a few events, and even these are wrapped in obscurity. The religious story of the Acadians during this time of spiritual destitution is known still less. Father Ignatius of Paris harbored in 1656 the gravest apprehensions regarding their spiritual welfare. "We may conclude," he writes,¹⁶⁹ "that religion throughout Acadia will be shortly overthrown, unless the best measures are promptly taken for its support. Nothing can be clearer, for if all the Christian French are abandoned who are living at present in Port Royal under the rule of the English heretics, as well as the Abenaki converts who inhabit the vast region surrounding the Bay of Fundy, and if they do not receive any further spiritual succor, how shall they stand against the powers of darkness? The other Frenchmen who live in the settlement of St. Peter at Cape Canso and in the settlement of Nepigiguit and all the Christian Abenakis inhabiting these latter regions, have their faith evidently endangered, especially if these heretics should advance and occupy the whole country. If they should reach this point I venture to say that they will altogether expel and utterly destroy our Faith from the St. Lawrence River, on the banks of which there dwell, as I take it, some two thousand Christians under the care of the Jesuits: and so on both sides, Canada as well as Acadia, the Faith will be altogether blotted out." Fortunately all these apprehensions of Father Ignatius did not come true. The English did not advance any farther, and the Acadians kept their Faith.

The Acadian farmers seemingly were not molested. At

¹⁶⁸ Moreau, 263-265; Rameau, 110, 126-128; Ferland I, 497.

¹⁶⁹ *Relatio*, ed. cit., pp. 334, 338-339.

least, we do not hear of any persecutions by the English. Father Ignatius does not as much as hint at such. It was different however, with the few Catholics living at Port Royal. "I cannot command language," says Father Ignatius in 1656,¹⁷⁰ "adequate to express the unutterable anguish that tortures me, when I see at this moment three noble girls, and as many noble boys, all the children of the late Viceroy of Acadia (D'Aunay), standing among wolves along with their noble mother at Port Royal. Their Faith is in all the greater danger because of their tender years. It is true that the oldest is of a marriageable age, but this is all the worse, for she will be urged to marry some heretic. Of the conflicts which the eldest brother, a lad of fifteen years, is at this moment enduring, I cannot speak in detail, and now there is no one in sight to help these children in their great distress." Happily the fears of Father Ignatius proved groundless. In the course of the year 1655 all the children of D'Aunay had passed to France. There were four boys and four girls. None of them ever re-visited their native land. The four boys joined the French army, and lost their lives on French battlefields. The four girls spent their lives within the Convent walls.¹⁷¹

The banished Capuchins used every influence in France to regain their former mission. "The Capuchin Fathers of the Province of Paris, who had charge of this mission," to quote the *Relation* of Father Ignatius,¹⁷² "had approached the King and had besought him to demand the restoration of three settlements (Port Royal, Fort St. John, and Fort Pentagoet). This was actually done, as appears from the Treaty of Peace recently published between France and England. (Treaty of Westminster, Nov. 1655). But

¹⁷⁰ *Relatio*, pp. 335, 339.

¹⁷¹ Moreau, 247, 266-269; Rameau, 105, 111; Collection de Docum., II (1884), 351-377, and *passim*.

¹⁷² *Edit. cit.*, pp. 334, 339. Cf. Ferland, I, 496.

this claim was referred for the time being to certain commissioners on account of certain difficulties put forward by Cromwell. Appeal should again be made to the King, to demand from the English Protector the restoration of the three settlements in question." The matter was finally arranged by the Treaty of Breda in 1667.

Meanwhile Father Ignatius had submitted plans to the proper authorities for the relief of the Acadians and their Indian friends. In his Relation to the Propaganda of 1656 he writes:¹⁷³ "If Cromwell does not restore these places to us it will become necessary to organize Guilds of French Merchants in the districts of Acadia that have not been occupied by the heretics, to wit, at Cape Sable, Port Rosignol (now Liverpool) and Port Hève, and Port Paspebiak (now Prospect), or in any other similar suitable place. . . . These Guilds should apply themselves to agriculture, and other industries. . . . From these places the missionaries living with the French will be able to travel in disguise through the woods and lakes to Port Royal, where they will have the opportunity of ministering to the Catholics. Even more easily they can reach them by sea, in the guise of traders, or in some other suitable dress. If the English offer resistance, and the French are not able to get possession of that part of Acadia, there remains the nearer portion of which the English are not yet in possession, and which they cannot take possession of owing to the Peace Treaty recently published, as mentioned above, between France and England. Let Guilds be organized in that nearer region, after the program mentioned above, in three or four suitable places, to wit, at Port St. Louis, at Port Archibucto, at Port Miramichi, and at Port Michkou (Miscou) or Cibigan. At Port St. Louis there is a river leading through the woods by a short route to Port Royal. At Port Archibucto and

¹⁷³ *Edit. cit.*, pp. 334-336, 339-341.

Miramichi there are streams which likewise lead through the woods to the great river St. John, and so the way is everywhere opened up for the missionaries by which they can reach these places and exercise their functions there. Also in the district of Pentagoet they can do this, for about half way up the river St. John there is a certain path that leads by forests and lakes to that region. In this way the older missionaries (the new ones only after several years) have the opportunity of visiting all the faithful and also the Abenakis everywhere scattered throughout the whole of Acadia. This mission however, entails great hardships and innumerable privations. Yet this yoke, heavy and irksome though it be, is rendered light and pleasant by their zeal and fervor of souls. . . . It is necessary that the old missionaries should return to the Mission, for they alone know the roads I have described above, and they are, moreover, familiar with the foreign language of the Abenakis. If they do not return, and the heretics remain on the Bay of Fundy, our native converts will be altogether lost, for new missionaries will never be able to make their way to them. And even supposing that they do make their way to them, they are lost all the same since the lessons they have learned from the earlier missionaries have now faded away and become almost effaced from their minds. How then shall they teach them these lessons afresh within a short time, since it will take them several years to understand and to speak the native language? I speak with knowledge, having lived eleven whole years in the Mission, and having traversed the whole country by land and sea."

"As to the support of the missionaries sojourning among the French and ministering to them in spiritual things there is no difficulty. Yet obstacles will arise in regard to the manner in which they may be able to pass in disguise among the English, or to trade with them in some way or other, so that they may bring assistance to the Catholics, or in re-

gard to the manner of supplying the Indians with certain temporalities to convert them more readily, or strengthen the others who have already made profession of the Faith. For while it would be hard for the French at first to assist us in these matters, owing to the other heavy expenses which they must incur during the first few years, they would without doubt contribute willingly to a special expenditure of this kind as soon as they receive from the produce of the soil or from their industries the means of meeting such expenditure."

"Moreover they might draw from the fund, or revenue, bequeathed by His Eminence, Cardinal Richelieu, to the Abenaki Seminary of the Capuchins in Acadia. In the meantime, to meet such expenditure, say of 300, or not less than 200 crowns, the Capuchins would have to approach the King, or the Royal Treasurers, beseeching them earnestly that out of the great sum given in alms every year they will, for the honor of God, provide, during a term of years for the expenditure that must be annually incurred. If this cannot be done, may God deign to reveal and disclose some other way whereby this expenditure may be met. The missionaries may meet to find or devise some more suitable means."

Alas, the appeal of the Capuchin failed to produce the intended result. The Royal Exchequer did not advance any money. The Guilds of French Merchants were never organized. The Acadian settlers were abandoned. The old missionaries were unable to come to the aid of their beloved flocks. Only two of them were fortunate enough to return to Acadia.

In 1654 the veteran missionary Balthazar of Paris had gone to Paris "for the purpose," to quote Father Ignatius' words,¹⁷⁴ "of warning the Capuchin Fathers of the Prov-

¹⁷⁴ *Relatio*, pp. 334, 338.

ince of Paris, who had charge of this Mission, that they should lose no time in attending to the interests of this Mission, which was in such great danger of collapsing. The great love of the salvation of his Abenakis inflamed or rather inebriated him to such a degree that last year (1655) he did everything possible to make his way back to them: he took shipping, but instead of landing on their coasts he was cast upon a foreign shore, and in the end was forced to return to France. From France he set out a second time, in the early spring of this present year, 1656, together with another missionary, intending to make straight for Hither Acadia, to visit his dear foster-children in Christ, to strengthen them in their Faith, to administer to them the Sacraments and all the spiritual succor of which they have been, alas, deprived for two years.” This time Father Balthazar had better luck. The two Capuchin missionaries arrived in disguise in Acadia. But that is all we know about them. How long they toiled in Acadia, is not told in history. They entirely disappeared soon after. Surely, they had trodden the familiar Indian trails, had visited their dear old Indian converts, and were laid to rest in the Acadian forests by their beloved Indians.¹⁷⁵

Why did not more of the older missionaries follow these intrepid apostles of the Abenakis? They were not wanting in zeal, but it was impossible. Insurmountable obstacles blocked their way. Father Ignatius of Paris voices the common sentiments of them all when he writes:¹⁷⁶ “On behalf of these Catholics so far away from here I am ready again to risk my life, if only ways and means be granted to make my way to them.” The obstacle could not be removed “in regard to the manner in which they might have been able to pass in disguise among the English.”¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁵ Jeron, p. 297; *Seraphic Child of Mary*, VI, Pittsburgh 1907, pp. 126-127.

¹⁷⁶ *Kelatio*, pp. 335, 339.

¹⁷⁷ *Relatio*, pp. 335, 340.

One Capuchin, however, remained in Acadia at the time of the English conquest. Father Joseph of Angers escaped and found safety among the savages. On March 17, 1667, he died in the midst of his Abenaki Indians. Joseph of Angers was the only Capuchin living in Acadia from the time when Father Augustin of Pontoise returned to France (1655) till the time when Father Balthazar and his companion landed in Acadia (1656). He was the last of the noble band of Capuchins who since 1632 had rendered signal services both to the French settlers and the Catholic Indians.¹⁷⁸

Acadia was ceded to France by the Treaty of Breda in 1667. Yet, the Capuchins did not return to their former mission-field. The reasons why they did not resume their activity in New France are not known. Possibly the veteran missionaries had died. It may be that their members were needed in other vineyards of the Lord. Perhaps they willingly relinquished this mission to the Recollects, who since 1664 had once more taken up their labors in Gaspé and northern Acadia. In 1656 Father Ignatius wrote:¹⁷⁹ "God grant that the settlements in Acadia be restored to us: if they are restored our Faith will forthwith flourish more gloriously everywhere in these places through the labors and the zeal of our missionaries." But the ardent wish of this zealous Capuchin was not granted.

Did the Capuchins exercise any civil power in Acadia? The Rt. Rev. Rocco Cocchia da Cesinale, O. M. Cap., is convinced that they were vested with political jurisdiction. "The Capuchins," he writes,¹⁸⁰ "governed civilly Acadia in many things. This function should fill a large page of its history. Our memoirs, however, are silent on this sub-

¹⁷⁸ Cesinale, III, 679; Jeron, 297; Candide, *Silhouettes*, p. 322. Cf. note 186.

¹⁷⁹ *Relatio*, pp. 334, 339.

¹⁸⁰ *Op. cit.*, III. p. 680.

ject." I am inclined to doubt very much that the Capuchins were intrusted with such political powers. Razilly and D'Aunay could easily govern their small communities. There was no need for the Capuchins to take part in the political administration. During the legal proceedings against Latour the Capuchins drafted three attestations in favor of D'Aunay. They did not sign the *procès verbal* drawn up by the Notary Public of Port Royal. They sent simple statements of their own to the French Court authenticated by their signatures. This fact is a striking indication that the Capuchins steered clear of political encroachments. True it is that to the seigniories of New France were annexed certain governmental rights. But the Capuchins themselves did not administer the estates belonging to their mission. D'Aunay's untimely death, however, reluctantly forced a change, and it may be safely assumed that the Capuchins directed their influence towards maintaining law and order during the turbulent times following his demise. They may have gained then some political ascendancy. This situation would explain the fact that the usurpers for the time being persecuted the Capuchins. Le Borgne's emissary detained, in 1652, two Capuchins in prison for five months. The English put to death in 1655 the Superior of the Capuchin mission. The well-known historian Moreau de Saint-Méry (d. 1819) therefore, assuredly distorts the facts when he writes:¹⁸¹ "Acadia was governed despotically for a long time by the Capuchins. Then they were succeeded by the English."

(*To be concluded.*)

¹⁸¹ Mss. in Archiv. de la Marine of Paris, VII, p. 6, quoted by Cesinale, III, p. 680.

AN OLD-TIME CONTROVERSY

THE ASHLEY - ST. PE LETTERS

EDITED BY REV. JOSEPH J. MURPHY, J. C. D.

(Conclusion.)

V. LETTER.

THE SAME TO THE SAME.

MOST HONORABLE SIR:

I will not deny it. You could well understand from my last letter, as also from its predecessors, that I have no little anxiety about you, and that too after the example of my Lord Jesus (John 11:33: "*Jesus, therefore, when He saw her weeping . . . groaned in the spirit and troubled Himself*"), and of His apostle (Rom. 9:2, "*I have great sadness and continual sorrow in my heart*"). But I do not at all understand why you should have conjectured that I have changed my mind about you. I freely declare that I have always felt just the same about you as I did at the very beginning. That is to say, I seem to see in you a man most highly endowed with talents, most abundant in culture and courtesy, upright, straightforward, religious, as much so (forgive the word) as one may be in a false religion, and one may be to a certain extent, Acts 13:50 ("*But the Jews stirred up religious and honorable women and the chief men of the city*"). "But," you say, "you have included me among the infidels." By your leave, most excellent Sir, it is not I who have attached you, but you who have attached yourself to their number. You were glad that so much charity was found among us. Well, then, doubtless you

will maintain that faith is found likewise, for without this there is surely no charity. But if faith is among us, it is consequently not among you. Then where faith is wanting—you see what remains. But these things I remember arguing in the previous letter. I come back to your own.

You ask me, most honorable Sir, whether I do not fear sometimes lest the apostle's saying might have reference to us (1 Tim. 4: 3, "*Now the Spirit manifestly saith that in the last times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy and having their consciences seared, forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by the faithful*"). I reply, before God I have never feared, and there is no reason why I ever should fear; for we are not of yesterday, a thing for which Tertullian upbraided the innovators of his day, nor have we appeared "*in the last times,*" since we go back by a legitimate succession of pastors to the beginning of the church itself, nor do we "*give heed to spirits of error or doctrines of devils,*" as some of your leaders either confess or boast that they have done. Of "*hypocrisy,*" of a "*seared conscience*" which can be found alike in false worshippers of either true or false religion, I say nothing, because these things are irrelevant; but, to come to the mark at which I see you are aiming, I say we do not "*forbid marriage*"; experience shows this, for in Christ and in the church there is marrying and giving in marriage every day: I except those who, in accordance with the doctrine of Christ (Matt. 19: 12: "*And there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven*"), and the counsel of Paul (1 Cor. 7: 25: "*Now concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord, but I give counsel, as having obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful*"), restrain themselves from marriage. But you "*take not this word*" (Matt. *ibid.*). Some of our people, the

majority, I should say, obtain the same mercy from the Lord as the apostle, and strive to show themselves faithful to it. It is different with you. Meanwhile, this is a true saying: "*Vow ye, and pay to the Lord your God: all you that are round about Him, bring presents,*" (Ps. 75: 12), and also this: "*It is much better not to vow, than after a vow not to perform the things promised*" (Eccles. 5: 4).

Concerning abstinence from food, I say

1. On most days of the year we partake indiscriminately of all sorts of food "*with thanksgiving,*" and, indeed, nothing is forbidden among us as evil of its own nature, which alone the apostle reproves when he says: "*For every creature of God is good*" (I Tim. 4: 4).

2. I say, as to our abstaining on certain days from certain kinds of food, we do this for the sake of penance and mortification, after the example of Daniel (1: 12: "*Let pulse be given us to eat and water to drink*"), of John the Baptist (Luke 1: 15: "*He shall drink no wine nor strong drink*"; Matt. 3: 4: "*And his meat was locusts and wild honey*"), and in order to obey mother church, which surely can as well forbid, for example, the eating of meats, as she could forbid in its time the eating of blood and things strangled (Acts 15: 20: "*But that we write unto them that they refrain themselves . . . from things strangled and from blood*"). It irks me to tarry longer in disposing of this most wretched and silly objection, which has been met to redundancy a thousand times, as you must know. Besides, you are aware, I suppose, that this passage plainly relates to Manichaeans, Ebionites, and other yet more ancient heretics, who corresponded in conduct and doctrine with those whom the holy apostle foretells.

You proceed and again ask whether Purgatory does not conduce more to our profit than to the salvation of souls? I see what you have in mind, the offerings for Masses and funerals. But I reply: beyond all comparison more profit

accrues to the departed from the sacrifices and prayers of the priests, namely, by God's favor, the hastening of eternal blessedness; whereas to these (the priests) it is indeed merely succor for the present life. Moreover, if you are speaking to me as a Jesuit, I answer that not the least particle of that temporary revenue is devoted to me or to my comrades, for we are warned by a solemn law to follow to the letter that (injunction) of Matt. 10: 8: "*Freely have you received, freely give.*" Again, you have no right to complain against others who either receive or demand compensations of this sort. Read 1 Cor. 9: 7, 11, 13 "*Who serveth as a soldier at any time at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? Who feedeth the flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock? . . . If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we reap your carnal things? . . . Know you not that they who work in the holy place, eat the things that are of the holy place; and they that serve the altar, partake with the altar*"). But whence, pray, comes the living of your own selves? Not indeed "*by the altar,*" I know, for you have none, but Paul had, Heb. 13: 10 ("*We have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle*"). But however you live, at all events, if I mistake not, it is from your ministerial services.

You ask, thirdly, "if I believe the souls of the dead will be released from sufferings by the money of friends and by our prayers": I use your words. Of my own prayers I will say nothing—too cold I feel them and far too unworthy to be heard by God, unless perchance through supreme mercy. Of others in general I say,—Why may it not be, Sir, that under God's favor, souls may be aided and even set free by the prayers and alms of the faithful? Otherwise how do you yourself understand that (passage) of 1 Cor. 15: 29 ("*Otherwise what shall they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then bap-*

tized for them?"), or of Tobias 4: 18 ("Lay out thy bread and thy wine upon the burial of a just man"), or of 2 Mach. 12: 43-46 ("He sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead... . It is, therefore, a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins"), a book which is canonical, whether you will or nil it? And even if you do not receive it as such, at least you cannot deny that it is historical, and a witness to the faith of Judas, the high priest of the Jews.

You ask, in the fourth place, (as is your wont, freer with questions, a little more chary with answers), you ask, I say, "if I believe that a man can forgive sins?" and at once you answer, "I know you cannot so believe." Wait, please: you are mistaken. I do so believe, I do firmly so maintain, prepared, with God's aid, to die willingly for this faith. But in company with what Surety, what Author, do I so believe? Why, with the Truth itself, Jesus Christ Our Lord (Matt. 18: 18 "*Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven; whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed also in heaven;*" John 20: 23, "*Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained*"). Unless I am deceived, Christ is here speaking to men. Men, therefore, God willing, God acting, can forgive sins, just as they can raise the dead and perform other miracles. Do not then think in your heart with the Scribes, the constant persecutors of Christ, "*Who can forgive sins but God only*" (Mark 2: 7). But what I believe that same the Catholic people, when rightly brought up, believe; and so they confess their sins (and without charge, too, contrary to what you say) into the ear of duly authorized priests; for by what other arrangement could we discern and judge whether sins should be remitted or retained, for, as you know, we have both these powers from Christ. And

let these few things, among many (that might be said), suffice as answers to your questions.

You exhort me, my dear Sir, to free the populace from deceptions. O! that I could! I would free you first of all, then your people, finally everybody. You wish that I would let them see with their own eyes. I am not hindering anybody. But, alas, how many whose eyes have been opened see nothing, till they receive sight from some Ananias (Acts, 9: 8). How many there are who seeing, see not (cf. Isaiah 6: 10), or "*see errors for themselves*" (Id. 30: 10). Besides, *Faith* is not by sight, but "*by hearing*," and "*Blessed are they that have not seen, and have believed*" (John 21: 29). But be it (as you will): let everyone see with his own eyes, what then? "*Every one will err in his own way*" (Isaiah, 47: 15), "*everyone will turn aside into his own way*" (Id. 53: 6). There will be almost as many opinions as heads, a thing not uncommon among you, men who certainly have eyes! and so what you say will come true: "They will act very differently," but whether much better, or, more likely, much worse, be you the judge. But where, then, will be the unity of the Faith into which we ought to meet? (Eph. 4: 3-13).

Well, but you say, "the obedience of Catholics is blind, and I consider it worthless." Really now? I do not pronounce it so blind that it does not see clearly, and more clearly than the noonday sun, that it is enough to have believed and obeyed the teaching and admonishing church, the depositary of Christ's doctrine and authority. What more do you ask?

"Let the holy scriptures," you say, "be delivered into the hands of the people." I am willing: let it be done, but with this needful caution, 2 Peter, 1: 20: that "*no prophecy of them (scripture) be made by private interpretation.*" You proceed to predict what will come to pass: "The people will emphatically reject the doctrines of Purgatory,

of Transubstantiation, of confession." Far be it, Sir, and with God's far favor will it be, that you have prophesied correctly. Our people read the scriptures, and the more they read the more they are confirmed in the faith of these doctrines, unless, perhaps, "*certain unlearned and unstable*" ones (2 Peter, 3: 16), may "*heap to themselves teachers having itching ears*" (2 Tim. 4: 3), or happen on "*lying teachers*" (2 Peter, 2: 1) who, to the destruction of them and theirs, teach them to wrest them and twist them to the defense of error. But that men of this sort should reject the teaching of the church is nothing strange.

Nevertheless, cease, most honorable Sir, cease to hope it will come to pass that this teaching, with its defenders, will go to ruin. So hoped many of your people in former times, so they even announced that it had been accomplished—with what result it is plain to see. Those doctrines, my dear Sir, will stand; they will stand so long as the church of Christ shall stand, against which "*the gates of hell shall not prevail*" (Matt. 16: 18), and with which Christ shall be "*even to the consummation of the world*" (Matt. 28: 20).

I should make no end of writing if I choose to follow up everything you touch in passing. I leave them. Still, there is one thing which I am unwilling not to glance at. "Men," you say, "will some day use their reason, and they will reject whatever conflicts with reason." But how wide a gate you open—unwittingly, I suppose, and unwillingly—to atheists, to deists, in fact to all unbelievers. Not so the apostle (2 Cor. 10: 5: "*bringing into captivity every intellect to the obedience of Christ.*") No more. Do you, meanwhile, meditate and beware lest under pretext of reason you foster irreligion.

The bearer of your letter I know only by name. It is indeed well that you have not molested him in his religion; I hope it may be well that you wished he might see what I

wrote. But, as I hear, he has not a very keen-sighted mind. Be that as it may, I feel grateful to him, since through his agency I have learned of your welfare. Farewell, ever dearest Sir, and love a little in return me, your most loving servant in Christ, and, in Him also, a servant most dutiful to you.

J. B. ST. PÉ, *of the Society of Jesus.*

Montreal, 18 July, 1752.

VI. LETTER.

THE SAME TO THE SAME.

MOST HONORABLE SIR:

The Peace of Christ!

I hear that one of our people is preparing for a journey towards Deerfield. I will not be guilty of allowing this opportunity to escape me, since I was greatly wishing a little while ago to express once more my very ardent attachment to you, and also to send along this old letter, copied off a year ago and more by another hand, for mine was trembling. As that is so long, this may well be shorter: lest too much in the way of writing become a burden and a weariness to you. Nor would I hesitate to stop here, but unexpectedly a new reason has intervened for writing somewhat more at length. And this it is.

They say a widow named *Lydia Gondag* is living in your district. Last spring she wrote to her young daughter, who, while yet a little girl, was taken captive in the battle of Sarastog, and having been ransomed by a woman of the first rank, was some time afterwards placed in a hospice managed by pious women, and was entrusted to their care with this design, namely, that she should have a Religious and Christian education, which has been done to the present time. She is still living in the same place, now grown older and absolutely contented with her lot. But she

asked me to get word back to her mother, (which will you please do?) that it is impossible for her to journey home, nor would she wish to, were it possible, although she is affected with an extraordinary desire to see again her dearest and most loving mother. But a way of satisfying the wish of both can be entered on by having the mother come hither. For the Mother Superior of that hospice has promised the girl that she will receive the mother in the house and supply her with food and clothing, on the understanding that she conduct herself properly and devote herself to such woman's work as she is acquainted with and adapted for.

If that is agreeable to the mother and she comes, I cannot tell you what delight it will give the daughter, who says that she counts this the height of her wishes, esteeming herself unhappy in this one thing, that, in order to serve God and care for her own salvation she is obliged to be absent from her most beloved mother. Most tenderly and most reverently she sends greetings to her, also to her brother, very lovingly and in the spirit of a true sister.

I omit a thousand (literally, six hundred) things to the same purport which were added by the girl, who is above the average in cleverness, and is endowed, as it seems, with excellent talents. But enough on these matters.

I beg you, Sir, to please give in my name a greeting, as hearty as possible, to my dearest Mr. Norton, and to believe me ever your most respectful servant in Christ, Adieu.

J. B. ST. PÉ.

Montreal, 6 May, 1753.

THE WORK OF BISHOP KENRICK IN PHILADELPHIA*

THE VISITATIONS

Eighty-six years have just passed since Francis Patrick Kenrick came to Philadelphia, July 7, 1830, to take up his work as Administrator of this diocese. For the next twenty-one years, from July 7, 1830, to October 9, 1851, when he left Philadelphia to enter upon new cares as Metropolitan of Baltimore, the life and interests of Bishop Kenrick are reflected in the life and interests of his episcopal charge.

The work of Bishop Kenrick lives, of course, in the spiritual life and organized development of the seven sees which now occupy the ground of the scattered missions of 1830. We can hardly imagine, or appreciate the conditions of the pioneer Catholic settlers who were laboring to make new homes within the limits of this diocese in 1830, extending, as it did then, from the shores of Lake Erie to Cape May, from the upper Delaware river to the eastern boundaries of West Virginia. Bishop Kenrick saw these conditions: as a shepherd of souls, he saw the problems which he must face and solve.

How to know the peculiar needs of this people, how to provide for this household of the faith, of various nations, how to train priests and fit men for apostolic work on the frontiers, were questions which no mere theorizing could answer. The man of theory, the stu-

* *Diary and Visitation Record of the Rt. Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, 1830-1851.* Translated and edited by permission and under the direction of His Grace the Most Reverend Edmond F. Prendergast, Archbishop of Philadelphia. 1916. Pp. 298.

dent and the lover of books must prove himself the conservative man of action. Apart from the task of counteracting the unsavory influence of Hogan's rebelliousness and final apostacy, and the unfilial and unloyal claims of trustees, these were points of positive constructive work, which must open the way to the undoing of any errors of judgment or mistakes of the past.

We have the proof of the Bishop's practical solutions in the work and efficiency of the Seminary, first opened in 1832, in an upper room of the clergy residence at St. Mary's, and now, at Overbrook, still carrying on the original plan and purpose of Bishop Kenrick. The textbooks in dogmatic and moral theology, published first in 1842, stand for the solution of another problem. After more than two centuries of interested and partisan views among the theologians of Europe, Kenrick's Theologies take their rank with the first standards of orthodoxy and sound moral principles in the history of modern theological methods. The conditions of the times, the needs of priests and people in this diocese, and in the American missions, as a whole, left little room for mere ornament, and less of leisure for the refinements of one-sided orthodoxy, or the endless squabbles about systems of probabilism.

But from the viewpoint of the historian, and as having a lasting human interest, as a record of personal experience covering a period of more than twenty-one years of the exercise of the pastoral office, the "*Dairy*" of Bishop Kenrick has a value which is quite distinct from the work and influence of the Seminary, or any contribution that he made to the standard literature of theology,

It has been called the "Dairy and Visitation Record": the subject-matter probably warrants the name. But the Bishop himself describes it in his own characteristic

way as: "Memoranda quaedam ad me Franciscum Patritium Kenrick Episcopum Arathensem et coadiutorem Philadelphiensis Episcopi pertinentia, eorum quae in administranda dioecesi Philadelphiensi per annos plusquam vigintiunum gessit, duodecim Administratoris titulo, a 22 Aprilis, 1842 ad 9 Octobris, 1851 tanquam Episcopus Philadelphiensis."

Two points are worthy of notice in this title, which has been retained in the original form and printed as the *Inscriptio Authentica* at the head of the Diary entries. First: The inscription is evidently genuine. Only Kenrick, in the first person, quite naturally would write: "*me Franciscum Patritium*:" and only Kenrick, on second thought, would cross out the "*me*" for the more objective, historic form of the third person. Second: The title or inscription certainly was written after the work of the Diary was done, after the accumulation of twenty-one years of recorded notes. It is made to fit the division of time and the order of the work, first as Administrator, down to the twenty-second day of April, 1842, then, as Bishop of Philadelphia, to the time of his going to Baltimore, October ninth, 1851.

Whether or not the Bishop had in mind that the scraps of the present may become the treasures of the future we have no means of knowing now. But, from the peculiar choice of facts recorded, and some of the circumstances in detail, it appears that the main purpose, at least, was only to keep an index for personal guidance in the work of governing the diocese and the care of souls.

Between the years 1830 and 1840 there is not a break in the regular yearly visitation of the diocese. The only years for which there is no record of a general visitation are 1841, 1843 and 1848. The counties of the extreme north-west, Erie, Crawford, Warren, Mercer and Ve-

nango, were not visited until 1834. The reason will be apparent, I think, from the following list of places gathered from the Diary. It represents, so far as I can find, the known centers of Catholic life in the diocese in 1830, with the exception, perhaps, of a French settlement in Clearfield County, another French settlement out from Meadville, in Crawford County, a settlement of Germans near Elk Creek, in Erie County, a colony of Irish in Wayne County, near Mount Pleasant, and a few families of Irish, German and Alsatian Catholics living along the Susquehanna and Tioga Turnpike, on the Loyalsock, in Lycoming (now Sullivan) County.

Pittsburg, with two churches, St. Patrick's and St. Paul's, the latter still unfinished, had two priests, Father Charles Bonaventure Maguire, O.S.F., and Father Patrick Rafferty, who was later, 1840 to 1863, the rector of St. Francis Xavier's, Philadelphia. The two Dominicans, Father Vincent Raymacker and Father Van der Weijer, appear to have been doing missionary work in the diocese, with residence, though not a canonical foundation of the order, at Pittsburg. After the death of Father Patrick Lonergan, or, at any rate, after he gave up these missions, the counties of the southwest, Washington, Greene and Fayette, with mission centers at Brownsville, Waynesburg, Washington and West Alexandria, evidently depended for the consolations of religion on the occasional visits of Father Rafferty from Pittsburg.

Buffalo Creek in Butler County was the mission center of Father Patrick O'Neill. From this place northward as far as Lake Erie, including the counties of Mercer, Venango, Crawford and Erie, there was apparently no priest; and there were few Catholics before 1837, when Father Henry Herzog labored among them. Eastward

from Lake Erie, in the northern tier of counties, Warren, McKean, Potter, Tioga, Bradford, as far as Silver Lake in Susquehanna County, there seems to have been no priest or chapel.¹

Youngstown, in Westmoreland County, near the Theodore Browsers' foundation known as "Sportsman's Hall" and "O'Neil's Victory", was under the care of Rev. Terence McGirr.

Loretto, in Cambria County, with its missions was in charge of Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, the prince and pioneer priest of the Alleghanies.

Newry, in Huntingdon County, was in charge of Rev. John O'Reilly.

Lewistown, in Mifflin County, was under the care of Rev. Patrick Devy (or Leavy).

Bedford, in Bedford County, with numerous missions was under the care of Rev. Thomas Heyden.²

Chambersburg, in Franklin County, was in charge of the Rev. Ferdinand McCosker.

Conewago, in Adams County, was the centre of many missions attended by the Jesuits.

Goshenhoppen, in Berks County, another centre of Jesuit missions since about 1741.

Harrisburg, in Dauphin County, was in charge of the Rev. Michael Curran.

¹Towanda, in Bradford County, was not visited until 1836; and the French "Asylum" settlement was demoralized as a Catholic community. Most of the families had returned to France after the revolution; some lost the faith.

²The Catholic Miscellany, July 24, 1830, p. 30, has an account of the journey, and incidents by the way, of Bishop Kenrick from Bardstown to Philadelphia, accompanied by Bishop Conwell and Father Nicholas O'Donnell, O.S.A. At Ebensburg, Cambria Co. they "received the obeisance of the Rev. Patrick Duffy, charged with the care of this Congregation." I have been unable to locate this Father Duffy from the text of the Diary or elsewhere. The Rev. James Bradley seems to have had charge of Ebensburg, attended from Newry, after his ordination and appointment in September, 1830.

Lancaster, in Lancaster County, was under the pastoral care of the Rev. Bernard Keenan, with Rev. Francis Varin assistant.

Pottsville, in Schuylkill County, was in charge of Rev. John Fitzpatrick.³

Silver Lake, in Susquehanna County, with a "mission" at Carbondale was in charge of Rev. William J. Clancy.⁴

Wilmington and *Coffee Run*, in the state of Delaware, were under the care of the Rev. Patrick Kenny and George A. Carrell.

Trenton and *Pleasant Mills*, in New Jersey, were visited by the Rev. William O'Donnell, O.S.A., from St. Augustine's, Philadelphia; Trenton once each month, and Pleasant Mills once in two months.

Philadelphia with its four churches had apparently nine priests, including the Bishop Conwell, in regular service. At St. Mary's, Jeremiah Keilly and Thomas De Silva; at St. Joseph's, John Hughes and Terence J. Donahoe; at Holy Trinity, Cornelius J. Van der Braak; at St. Augustine's, Michael Hurley, Nicholas O'Donnell and William O'Donnell. These nine, however, had the care of the missions of New Jersey, as noted above, and probably westward as far as West Chester, and northward to Haycock and Easton.⁵

³ Milton, in Northumberland County, appears to have been visited from Pottsville by Father John Fitzpatrick; though it was visited also by the Jesuits from Goshenhoppen or Conewago.

⁴ Silver Lake and Friendsville were quite certainly the first Catholic communities within the present limits of the diocese of Scranton to enjoy the regular or occasional visits of a priest; though some of the families on the Loyalsock-Dunn, Deegan, Harrington, McMahon, Litzelswope, Bohl, Tahl, Sollinger, Lefevre, had probably settled there quite as early, 1818 to 1822.

I have been unable to find the time of Father Clancy's coming into the diocese.

⁵ The Catholic Miscellany in the report, as noted above, also states

The routes by which the Bishop reached these centers of pioneer Catholic life can be traced with considerable accuracy by following the main arteries of trade and travel, the roads, the turnpikes and canals, through the state as they existed in 1830. Only once, apparently, did the Bishop leave the city for visitation by railway. This was in 1842, when he went to Parksburg by railroad, visited Doe Run, then passed on, probably by railroad also, to Lancaster, and from Lancaster to Columbia.

The roads usually followed were, first, the "Lancaster pike" for Lancaster, and branching off southward for York, Conewago, Chambersburg and farther west, or turning northward for Elizabethtown, Lebanon, and Harrisburg. The old "Ridge Road" was the most direct route probably to reach Reading, Goshenhoppen and Pottsville. The "Bustleton Turnpike" was a probable route to Haycock and Easton in 1833. In 1836 the way was by steamboat to Bristol, then by steam car to Morrisville; and from Morrisville fifty miles by stage to Easton; from Easton, again by stage, nearly seventy miles to Clark's Corners, then thirteen miles to the Irish settlement near Mount Pleasant, in Wayne County. From Mount Pleasant thirty-six miles to Binghamton, N. Y., then southward again into Susquehanna County, to Silver Lake, Friendsville, on to Carbondale to Wilkesbarre, (Here is the first record of Mass in Wilkesbarre, in the home of a widow, Gorman, September 7, 1836), then over the mountain to Pottsville, and back again to Milton; then over the opposite mountain by the Susquehanna and Tioga Turnpike to the Catholic settlement on the Loyalsock, expecting, as the Bishop says, to reach

that the diocese has 35 priests in actual service, "of whom one only is American, one Portuguese, one Russian, one Polander, one Dutch, two Flemish, two Germans, one Swiss, and twenty-five Irish."

Warren by that route. But, instead, he was forced to turn southward again to reach Bellefonte, by way of stage, running second day from Elmira to Williamsport. Here, at Bellefonte he was again on one of the main arteries, a "pike", running quite directly through Clearfield and Franklin to Meadville in Crawford County.

This is a fair example of one side at least, the side of strenuous labor in these missionary visitations. There was another, and a brighter side, which could console the heart of a shepherd of souls, of which we get an occasional glimpse, sometimes quite pathetic, of loyalty to the faith and a deep love for religion, in those humble, hard-handed toilers, who knew the struggle to sustain life, but knew also how to keep the treasure of the Christian heritage for their children.⁶

Usually a little more than two months are given to the annual visitation. In 1830 the Bishop left Philadelphia September 5 and returned November 8. In 1831 he left Philadelphia August 2, and returned October 5. In 1832 the visitation is divided into three periods, two before, and one after the cholera epidemic of that year in the city. In 1833 the fourth visitation is again cut into two periods, July 16 to August 13. August 24 begins the second period, but the record of its close has been cut from the manuscript. In 1834 the fifth visitation begins in April. He is at Conewago April 27. There is mention, before this, of Carlisle, Paradise and Pigeon Hill, but the beginning is clipped from the page.

⁶It is a tradition, which the translator has from his mother, for the Loyalsock settlement, and from the Ven. Mother Mary Columba and Mother Ambrose of West Chester, for Susquehanna County, that the early settlers used to assemble on Sunday in the home of a neighbor to say the Rosary in common, and hear some spiritual reading. It would be interesting to know what books they had to read. The translator has seen in the homes of decendants of the pioneers ponderous old prayerbooks and something like lives or legends of the Saints.

In this visitation he goes by way of Pittsburg to the counties of the northwest, celebrates Mass in a private house in Erie June 1, returns by way of Phillipsburg, Bellefonte, Jersey Shore, Milton, through the counties of the northeast, Susquehanna and Wayne, to Easton and Tamaqua, and reaches Philadelphia July 7.

In 1835 he is on visitation from June 25 to September 26. In 1836, August 19 to October 24; in 1837, June 1 to September 8; in 1838, June 13 to September 17; in 1839, June 12 to August 7; in 1840, June 27 to September 1, and a second period, October 9 to October 30. In 1842 the visitation begins at Doe Run, June 18, and closes at Phoenixville September 11. In 1844, after the riots of May and July, there is a visitation; but the diocese of Pittsburg is now out; and the entries are much more brief, with less of detailed information. In 1845, after the visit to Europe, the fourteenth visitation is begun August 22; and closes with confirmation in St. Francis Xavier's, Fairmont, December 21, though there are intermissions.

The visitations for 1846, 1847, 1849, 1850, 1851 are very briefly described. But there are other items recorded, which show the growing importance of new phases of work in the city, and a wider influence of the man who was being regarded not improbably, as a possible successor in the first metropolitan see of the land. It is, in fact, this work of Bishop Kenrick, right in the city of Philadelphia, his influence at home under circumstances quite unusual and very trying, that best proves the man and shows his character.

F. E. T.

FATHER PETER HELBRON'S GREENSBURG, PA., REGISTER

(Continued)

Copied from the original by the Rev. Father John, O. S. B., of Saint Vincent's Abbey, Pennsylvania. Translated by Lawrence F. Flick, M.D., LL.D.

1806

Handel, Joseph, of Dionysius and Catharine Handel, six weeks old, baptized January 5th. Sponsors, Joseph Handel and Mary Braun [Brown?].

Mcfeyn, William, of Patrick and Anna Mcfeyn, born July 31st (evidently of the preceding year), baptized March 9th. Sponsors, Dionysius Conner and Elizabeth, his sister.

Original book, page 48.

Vagener, Henry, of John and Barbara Vagener, born February 25th, baptized April 3d. Sponsors Henry and Elizabeth Brik.

Septer, Margaret, of Adam and Mary Septer, born January 14th, baptized April 6th. Sponsors, Peter and Margaret Noell.

Ruffner, Salome, of Christian and Mary Ruffner, born January 4th, baptized April 6th. Sponsors, John Henry Ruffner and Mary Ruffner, maiden.

Duff, Anna, of Paul and Anna Duff, born January 8th, baptized April 6th. Sponsors, John Hargen and Bridget Rogers.

Brannen, Peter, of Michael and Mary Brannen, born April 2d, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, Anthony Bern [Byrne?] and his wife.

Schmidt, Catharine, of Matthias and Elizabeth Schmidt, born January 1st, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, Nicholas and Susan Schwoerer.

Reily, Margaret, of Martin and Anna Reily, date of birth not given, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, Patrick Hely [Healy?] and Anna, his wife.

Reily, Mary, of Martin and Anna Reily, three years old, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, one of the Hely family and Anna.

Lachly, Salome, of John and Margaret Lachly, born April 5th, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, Andrew Claudwill and his wife.

Gihlen, Margaret, of Philip and Susan Gihlen, born April 9th, baptized May 5th. Sponsors, Andrew Gihlen and Mary Gihlen, widow.

McDonnell [McDonald?], Rose, of ——— McDonnell and Rose, his wife, born June 30th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 10th. Sponsors, John and Catharine Meyer.

Wite [White?], Anthony, of James and Elizabeth Wite, date of birth not given, baptized May 11th. Sponsors, ——— Quickly [Quigly?] and wife.

Galeghar [Gallagher?], Charles, of Michael and Margaret Galeghar, date of birth not given, baptized May 11th. Sponsors not given.

———, Jacob, six years old (surname of child not given and names of parents not given), baptized May 11th. Sponsors, ——— Schoerer and Mary Haegen.

Original book, page 49.

White, James, of ——— White and Elizabeth, his wife, date of birth not given, baptized May 11th. Sponsors, James and Cecilia Reily.

Haeghe, George, of Abraham and Anna Haeghe, born October 4th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 11th. Sponsors, John and Anna McQuire [McGuire?].

Reily, Anna, of James and Cecilia Reily, date of birth not given, baptized May 11th. Sponsors, John Meguire [McGuire?] and Rose Manteck [Montague?].

Galegher [Gallagher?], Margaret of Michael and Margaret Galegher, date of birth not given, baptized May 11th. Sponsors, James Braun [Brown?] and his sister.

Wilterstaedt, Rose, of John and Petronilla Wilterstaedt, date of birth not given, baptized May 11th. Sponsors, Clearsen and Margaret.

Daugerthy [Dougherty?], Charles, of James and Anna Daugerthy, date of birth not given, baptized May 12th. Sponsors, John Quickly and Bridget Daugerthy.

Roger, Anna, of Frank and Elizabeth Roger, date of birth not given, baptized May 11th. Sponsors, Simon Manteck [Montague?] and Mary McQuier [McGuire?].

Victor, Anna, of John and Margaret Victor, date of birth not given, baptized May 18th. Sponsors, Michael and Elizabeth Schoerer.

Thern, Mails Joseph, of Michael Thern and his wife Elizabeth, born July 19th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 18th. Sponsors, Edward Borns [Burns?] and Anna Trox.

Galeghar [Gallagher?], Susan, of Adam and Mary Galeghar, born March 2d, baptized May 19th. Sponsors, Charles and Catharine Haergen.

Morris, Margaret, of John and Catharine Morris, three years old, baptized May 19th. Sponsors, Patrick Mecguier [McGuire?] and Eva Victor.

Morris, Reuben, of John and Catharine Morris, six years old, baptized May 19th. Sponsors, Gerard Meccherry [McSherry?] and Bridget Meedemart [McDermott?].

Deleny, Elizabeth, of Dionysius and Mary Deleny, date of birth not given, baptized May 19th. Sponsors, Martin and Mary Therren.

Original book, page 50.

Meccherry [McSherry?], Margaret, of Gerhard and Catharine Meccherry, born July 15th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 19th. Sponsors, George and Mary Trox.

Victor, Mary, of John and Mary Victor, born March 25th, baptized May 25th. Sponsors, Hughy Beyl [Boyle?] and Mary Casthler.

Phillippi, Thomas, of Thomas and Mary Phillippi, date of birth not given, baptized May 25th. Sponsors, Jacob Eysenaegel and Susan Bayl [Boyle?].

Gerry, James, of Timothy and Susan Gerry, date of birth not given, baptized May 25th. Sponsors, Patrick Car [Carr?] and Sophie Mecferryn.

Mecbraid [McBride?], Petronilla, of ——— Mecbraid and Catharine his wife, date of birth not given, baptized May 25th. Sponsors, John and Mary Meckiver.

Caleghar [Gallagher?], Catharine, of John and Mary Caleghar, date of birth not given, baptized May 25th. Sponsors, Hughy Bail [Boyle?] and Catharine Galeghar.

Isly [Easly?], Margaret, of Ferdinand and Margaret Isly, born June 8th, baptized June 9th. Sponsors, John Borgoon [Burgoon?] and Mary Müller.

Carren, Salome, of John and Margaret Carren, born April 17th, baptized June 22d. Sponsors, James Roger and Eppy Coll.

Bivers, Barbara, of Thomas and Elizabeth Bivers, born March 2d, baptized June 29th. Sponsors, John Henry and Mary Zinsdorff.

Bivers, Elizabeth, of Thomas and Elizabeth Bivers, two years old, baptized June 22d. Sponsor, Elizabeth Henling.

Original book, page 51.

Ruffner, Mary Magdalen, of George and Sibylla Ruffner, born May 13th, baptized July 13th. Sponsors, Simon Noel and Catharine Isly [Easly?].

Meccefferty [McCafferty?], Charles, of Jacob Meccefferty and Catharine his wife, born May 23d, baptized July 20th. Sponsors, John and Mary Chalegar [Gallagher?].

Schilz [Schulz?], Catharine, of William and Mary Schilz, born March 27th, baptized July 28th. Sponsors, Simon and Catharine Ruffner.

Noel, Joseph, of Joseph and Margaret Noel, born August 3d, baptized October 5th. Sponsors, Joseph Schmidt and Elizabeth, maiden.

1807

Merckell, George, of John and Barbara Merckell, born November 13th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized March 29th. Sponsors, John Henry and Mary Zinsdorff, maiden.

Brick, Theresa, of Peter and Margaret Brick, born January 21st, bap-

tized March 29th. Sponsors, George Ruffner and Theresa Brick, maiden.

Müller, Mary, of Martin and Magdalen Müller, born December 25th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized March 29th. Sponsors, Frederick Kins and Anna Mary Henrich, maiden.

Koss, Elizabeth, of Joseph Koss and Mary Dopper, his wife, born January 11th, baptized March 30th. Sponsors, Joseph Aaron and Elizabeth Dopper, maiden.

Original book, page 52.

Noell, Michael, of Peter and Margaret Noell, born December 1st (evidently of the preceding year), baptized April 4th. Sponsors, Adam Kuhn and Mary Andress, maiden.

Peyfer, Peter, of George and Anna Peyfer, born August 9th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 25th. Sponsors, Henry Kuhn and Elizabeth Müller.

Schwerer, Nicholas, of Nicholas Schwerer and Catharine Garther, his wife, date of birth not given, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, James Meccful and Mary Schmidt.

Schwerer, Christina, of Nicholas and Catharine Schwerer, date of birth not given, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, Matthias Schmid and Elizabeth Henn.

Schwerer, Peter, of Nicholas and Catharine Schwerer, born September 7th, 1804, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, Peter Henn and Helen Meccfull [McFaul?].

Fields, Mary, of Philip and Catharine Fields, date of birth not given, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, Matthew Duff and Anna Fields.

Dagourthy [Dougherty?], John Benjamin, of James and Isabella Dagourthy, date of birth not given, baptized May 10th. Sponsors, Henry Monteck [Montague?] and Rose his wife.

O'Dannel, James, of Felix and Catharine O'Dannel, date of birth not given, baptized May 10th. Sponsors, John McQuire [McGuire?] and Mary Monteck [Montague?].

Merly, Sara, of James and Catharine Merly, date of birth not given, baptized May 10th. Sponsors, Michael and Bridget Dagourthy [Dougherty?].

Vorckman, Samuel Daniel, of Jacob and Mary Vorckman, date of birth not given, baptized May 17th. Sponsors, George Trox and Ann his wife.

Gelaspy [Gillespie?], Thomas, of Neil and Elizabeth Gelaspy, born March 26th, 1807, baptized May 17th. Sponsors, Edmund Borry and Susan Trox.

Meccedell, Elizabeth, of Patrick and Elizabeth Meccedell, date of birth not given, baptized May 17th. Sponsors, John Cannady [Kennedy?] and Elizabeth Therrin.

Original book, page 53.

Aschman, Aaron, of William and Catharine Aschman, date of birth not given, baptized May 17th. Sponsors, John Kuhn and Mary Muller. Meckeen [McKean?], Mary, of James Meckeen, twenty-one years of age, baptized May 27th and received into the church at the same time, having made her profession of Faith.

Cally [Kelly?], Mary, of John and Catharine Cally, date of birth not given, baptized May 24th. Sponsors, Edward Meccingly [McKinley] and Catharine his wife. (Then here follows the second entry of sponsors as Edward Meccingly and Bridget.)

Meccferrling, Edward, of Charles and Bridget Meccferling, date of birth not given, baptized May 24th. Sponsors, Daniel Boyl [Boyle?] and Catharine Meccferrling.

Carr, Crescentia, of Manasses and Catharine Carr, date of birth not given, baptized May 14th. Sponsors, John Hagerthy [Hagerty?] and Catharine Dugen.

Dugen, John, of John and Catharine Dugen, date of birth not given, baptized May 14th. Sponsors, Timothy and Petronilla Car.

Car [Carr?], Susan, of Patrick and Petronilla Car, date of birth not given, baptized May 14th. Sponsors, Hugo and Mary Boyl [Boyle?].

Mecgiven, Nicholas, of John and Mary McGiven, date of birth not given, baptized May 14th. Sponsors, John Meccferring and Susan Boyl [Boyle?].

Pathen [Patton?], Peter, of ——— Pathen and Frances his wife, date of birth not given, baptized May 14th. Sponsors, Daniel and Genevieve Boyl [Boyle?].

Car [Carr?], Catharine, of Charles and Anna Car, date of birth not given, baptized May 14th. Sponsors, James Meccingly [McKinley?] and Catharine Galaugher.

Dagourthy, Petronilla, of Nicholas and Crescentia Dagourthy, date of birth not given, baptized May 14th. Sponsors, John and Mary Meccingly.

Meccbraid [McBride?], George Car, lawful son of Thomas and Mary Meccbraid, date of birth not given, baptized May 24th. Sponsors, Thomas Meccbraid and Mary Caster.

Original book, page 54.

Hargens, William, of John and Bridget Hargens, born January 15th, baptized June 20th. Sponsors, Paul Doff and Bridget Meccdamerd [McDermott?].

O'Donner, Mary, of Daniel and Cecilia O'Donner, born October 16th, 1806, baptized July 19th. Sponsors, Patrick Meccdamert [McDermott?] and Ann Corrh.....,

Patten, John, of James and Rachel Patten, born February 11th, baptized September 13th. Sponsors, John Burgoon and Mary his wife.

Ruffner, John, of George and Elizabeth Ruffner, born August 21st, baptized September 13th. Sponsors, John Henry and Elizabeth Ruffner.

Griffen, Andrew, of John and Mary Griffen, born November 3, 1806, baptized November 15th. Sponsors, George Ruffner and Sibylla his wife.

Dieder, Peter, of Henry and Catharine Dieder, born May 9th, baptized December 25th. Sponsors, Peter Muller and Catharine Dopper, maiden.

Griefen, Mary Magdalen, of Henry and Magdalen Griefen, born June 3d, baptized December 27th. Sponsors, Simon Ruffner and Catharine his wife.

1808

Magen, Margaret, of Bernard and Salome Magen, born March 29th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized January 10th. Sponsors, Henry Kuhn and Margaret Broun.

Dauff, ———, of Paul and Johanna Dauff, born August 8th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized January 18th. Sponsors, Philip Dauffy [Duffy?] and Margaret Corry, his wife.

Original book, page 55.

Wagener, Susan, of John and Barbara Wagener, born February 18th, baptized April 24th. Sponsors, Timothy Conner and Petronilla his wife.

Septer, Catharine, of Adam and Mary Septer, born December 12th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized April 24th. Sponsors, George and Elizabeth Ruffner.

Brick, John, of Henry and Elizabeth Brick, born January 14th, baptized April 24th. Sponsors, John Wagener and Barbara his wife.

O'Donnel, Hugo, of Daniel and Cecilia O'Donnel, born February 10th, baptized April 24th. Sponsors, Patrick McDarmer and Mary Roger.

Megardy [McCarthy?], Elizabeth, of Patrick and Elizabeth Megardy, three months old, baptized May 1st. Sponsors, John Mecannery and Eleanor his wife.

Mecadeny, John, of Peter and Bridget Mecadeny, born on the 29th (month and year not given), baptized May 1st. Sponsors, John Dagaurthy and Mary his wife.

Mecadeny, Bridget, of Peter and Bridget Mecadeny, four years old, baptized May 1st. Sponsors, Daniel Fields and Mary Quickly [Quigley?].

Fields, Elizabeth, of Philip and Catharine Fields, born 27th (month not given), 1807, baptized May 1st. Sponsors, Jacob Müller and Sara his wife.

Müller, Mary, of Jacob and Sara Müller, born August 28th, 1807, baptized May 1st. Sponsors, Balthasar Good and Martha Douff.

Good, John, of Balthasar and Rose Good, born March 20th, 1807, baptized May 1st. Sponsors, Matthew Schmidt and Elizabeth Elsner.

Original book, page 56.

May, Patrick, of Patrick and Mary May, born February 25th, 1808, baptized May 1st. Sponsors, William Porcker and Elizabeth Mequier [McGuire?].

Brennen, Timothy, of Michael and Mary Brennen, born July 14th, 1807, baptized May 1st. Sponsors, Christopher and Catharine Brennen.

O'Harra, Mary, of Philip and Catharine O'Harra, born February 25th, baptized May 1st. Sponsors, John Lochery and Mary O'Harra.

Thomas, Thomas, of William and Mary Thomas, born December 29th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 1st. Sponsors, Leonard Doppens and Salome Cifny.

Meccfaull [McFaul?], James, of John and Mary Meccfaull, born February 29th, baptized May 1st. Sponsors, William Thomas and Petronilla Ross.

O'Brien, Mary, of Michael and Margaret O'Brien, born May 3d, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, William Forcker [Foraker?] and Anna his wife.

Meccaffry, Hugo, son of Hugo and Margaret Meccaffry, date of birth not given, baptized May 4th. Sponsors, Alexander May and Cecilia his wife.

Rogers, Patrick, of Frank and Elizabeth Rogers, born January 14th, baptized May 6th. Sponsors, Samuel Montacc [Montague?] and Anna Broun [Brown?].

Haegens, Elizabeth, of Atur [Arthur?] and Mary Haegens, born July 19th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 8th. Sponsors, Timothy Broun [Brown?] and Anna Collerik.

Schinegen, Joseph, of John and Elizabeth Schinegen, born September 6th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 9th. Sponsors, Patrick Dannely [Donnelly?] and Eleanor Melon.

Meguy [McHugh?], Margaret, of John and Margaret Meguy, five years old, baptized May 15th. Sponsors, Felix Boyl [Boyle?] and Anna his wife.

Boyl [Boyle?] Agnes, of Felix and Anna Boyl, a year and a half old, baptized May 15th. Sponsors, Patrick Mequy [McKee?] and Anna his wife.

Lachery, Margaret, of Patrick and Anna Lachery, born March 14th, baptized May 15th. Sponsors, James Mecivestyn and Anna his wife.

Reily, Mary, of Dionysius and Anna Reily, born May 17th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 15th. Sponsors, William Curry and Anna his wife.

Victor, Julia, of John and Mary Victor, born March 11th, baptized May 16th. Sponsors, George Trox and Anna his wife.

Megrady, Charles, of Patrick and Mary Megrady, born June 16th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 21st. Sponsors, Charles Flemming and Catharine his wife.

Mecbraid [McBride?], Margaret, of Hugo and Catharine Mecbraid, born July 29th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 21st. Sponsors, Anthony and Catharine Kelly.

Kelly, John, of Anthony and Catharine Kelly, born December 7th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 21st. Sponsors, Hugo and Catharine Mecbraid [McBride?].

Cary, Catharine, of Timothy and Susan Cary, born May 8th, baptized May 21st. Sponsors, Patrick and Sophie Meceelfrey.

Original book, page 57.

Ruffner, ———, son of George and Sibylla Ruffner, born February 2d, baptized May 26th. Sponsors, Simon and Catharine Ruffner.

Seywert [Seybert?], Rose, born January 21st, baptized May 29th. Sponsors, Joseph Boock and Rose his wife.

Trox, Amelia Anna, of Nicholas and Ruth Trox, born March 24th, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, John Borgoon [Burgoon?] and Mary his wife.

Merckell, Joseph, of John and Barbara Merckell, born April 6th, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, Jacob Henry and Margaret Syndorf.

Meccannell [McConnell?], Genevieve, of Jacob and Mary Meccannell, born February 15th, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, Timothy Conner and Margaret his daughter.

Borgoon, Joseph, of James and Martha Borgoon, born May 3d, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, James Mecquire [McGuire?] and Petronilla his wife.

Maholland [Mulholland?], Mary Ann, of David and Anna Maholland, born February 6th, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, Valentine Reinsell and Elizabeth his sister.

Handell, John, of Joseph and Mary Ann Handell, born May 10th, baptized June 5th. Sponsors, Dionysius Handell and Catharine his wife.

The following are from the month of May:

Goleagher [Gallagher?], John, of Anthony and Bridget Goleagher, born July 15th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 21st. Sponsors, Daniel Boyl and Susan Aron.

Ferry, Mary, of James and Catharine Ferry, born March 12th, baptized May 21st. Sponsors, John Meccginly [McKinly?] and Susan Galeagher [Gallagher?].

Morphy [Murphy?], Anna, of Terence and Margaret Morphy, born May 10th, baptized May 10. Sponsors, Charles Collick and Mary Devin.

Original book, page 58.

- Meccginly [McKinley?], James, of James and Catharine Meccginley, born March 14th, baptized May 21st. Sponsors, James Hegerthy [Hagerty?] and Mary Dugen.
- Meccferrien, Catharine, of John and Anna Meccferrien, nine years old, baptized May 21st. Sponsors, John and Catharine Meccferrien.
- Galeagher [Gallagher?], Peter, of John and Mary Galeagher, born September 22d (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 21st. Sponsors, Edward Meccgirley and Bridget his wife.
- Coll, Crescentia, of James and Salome Coll, born May 27th (evidently of the preceding year), baptized May 21st. Sponsors, Patrick Boyl and Crescentia Galeagher [Gallagher?].
- Dagcarthy [Dougherty?], Eleazer, of Lochly and Salome Dagcarthy, born August 31st (evidently of the preceding year), baptized June 12th. Sponsors, George Zinsdorff and Susan, his sister.
- Ferrell, Anna, of Cornelius and Margaret Ferrell, born May 16th, baptized June 12th. Sponsors, John Borgoon and Mary his wife.
- Müller, George, of Martin and Magdalene Müller, born May 27th, baptized July 3d. Sponsors, Conrad Henry and Elizabeth Maller.
- Konnly [Conley?], Peter, of Eiden Konnly and Mary Lacheren, born December 2d, 1807, baptized August 15th. Sponsors, R. P. Helbron and Mary Wight.
- Ruffner, Peter, of Simon and Mary Barbara Ruffner, born August 3d, baptized August 28th. Sponsors, George Ruffner and Sibylla, his wife.,
- Megill [McGill?], Susan, of James and Bridget Megill, born June 24th, baptized August 28th. Sponsors, Jacob Hoeny and Catharine, a maiden.
- Bivers, Susan, of Thomas and Elizabeth Bivers, born July 15th, baptized August 28th. Sponsors, Simon Noel and Susan Zinsdorf.

Original book, page 59.

- Noell, Margaret, of Joseph and Margaret Noell, born June 25th, baptized September 4th. Sponsors, Simon Ruffner and Margaret Griffy.
- Meckelfy, James, of Patrick and Anna Meckelfy, born July 28th, baptized September 4th. Sponsors, Patrick Dauffy and Elizabeth Seyfert.
- Mechachen, Sara, of Arthur and Margaret Mechachen, seven years old, baptized October 9th. Sponsors, John Wight and Theresa his wife.
- Mechachen, Andrew, son of the same father, baptized October 9th. Sponsor, George Ruffner.
- Mechachen, James, another son of the same father, seven years old, baptized October 9th. Sponsor, John Kelly.
- Mechachen, Joseph, another son of the same father; five months old,

baptized October 9th. Sponsors, Joseph Schmidt and Mary his wife.

Mechachen, Elizabeth, another daughter of the same father, four years old, baptized October 9th. Sponsors, Christian Ruffner and Catharine his wife.

Mechachen, Mary, another daughter of the same father, two years old, baptized October 9th. Sponsors, Jacob Allwein and Catherine, his wife.

Ruffner, Susan, of Christian and Mary Ruffner, born August 16th, baptized October 9th. Sponsors, John Wight and Theresa his wife.

Broccley, Bridget, of Patrick and Petronilla Broccley, 11 years old, baptized October 9th. Sponsors, Patrick Canrowe and his wife.

Pett, Mary, of Henry and Mary Pett, three years old, baptized October 9th. Sponsors, Michael Wiht with his wife.

Thernan, Michael, of Michael and Elizabeth Thernan, five months old, baptized by R. D. O'Brien on November 1st. Sponsors, Patrick Mecschiveston and Mary Lughton.

Mecary, Elizabeth, of James and Anna Mecary, five years old, baptized November 6th. Sponsors, Balthasar Good and Helen his wife.

Original book, page 60.

Murry, Mary, of James and Anna Murry, three years old, baptized November 6th. Sponsors, Alexander May and Margaret Mecady.

Gother, Jacob, of Thomas and Mary Gother, one year old, baptized November 6th. Sponsors, William Porcy and Anna Morphy.

Kuhn, Mary, of John and Sara Kuhn, eleven months old, baptized November 6th. Sponsors, John Mecfaull and Martha his wife.

Kuhn, Samuel, of John and Sara Kuhn, two years old, baptized November 6th. Sponsors, Christian Brannen and Mary Hugy.

Galgher [Gallagher?], James, of Martin and Margaret Galgher, five months old, baptized November 6th. Sponsors, Charles Wickley [Weakland?] and Elizabeth his wife.

Collen, William, of Patrick and Catharine Collen, three months old, baptized November 6th. Sponsors, William O'Hara and Eleanor Kelly.

May, Bernard, of Alexander and Cecilia May, two months old, baptized November 6th. Sponsors, Daniel Morphy and Elizabeth his wife.

Mecanny, Margaret, of John and Helen Mecanny, four months old, baptized November 7th. Sponsors, Jacob Thull and Sabina Wickson.

Thull, Jacob, of Jacob and Sabina Thull, one year old, baptized November 7th. Sponsors, Patrick Duff and Helen Mecanny.

[TO BE CONTINUED]

BISHOP MCDEVITT.

The consecration of the Right Reverend Philip R. McDevitt, D. D., as Fourth Bishop of Harrisburg was the occasion of an impressive ceremony in the Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul, Philadelphia, 21 September, 1916. For the second time in its history a president of the American Catholic Historical Society was raised to the episcopate, the first so honored being the late Bishop of Cleveland, the Right Rev. Ignatius F. Horstmann, D. D. The new Bishop received the sacred unction from his Metropolitan, the Most Rev. Archbishop Prendergast, assisted by Bishop FitzMaurice of Erie and Bishop McCort, auxiliary of Philadelphia. The sermon was preached by the Right Rev. Monsignor James P. Turner, D. D., a life-long friend of the newly consecrated prelate. The American Catholic Historical Society was well represented at the ceremony. Two former presidents, the Right Rev. Monsignor Henry and the Right Rev. Monsignor Drumgoole acted respectively as first deacon of honor and deacon of the Mass, while the Rev. Francis P. Siegfried, for years intimately connected with the work of the Society, was the second deacon of honor. The actual president, the Rev. William J. Lallou, officiated as the master of ceremonies, and in the procession with the guard of honor to His Grace walked two of our ex-presidents, Mr. Walter George Smith and Mr. Samuel Castner, Jr. For the first time in Philadelphia, the laymen invested with Papal honors assisted in the sanctuary in full costume, Sir James Ryan in the dark green uniform of a Knight of St. Gregory, wearing the Commendatore's sash and the Grand Cross, and Mr. Edward J. Du Mee, in the scarlet coat of a private Chamberlain to His Holiness.

By special authorization of the Cardinal Secretary of State, received through the Apostolic Delegate, the consecration was performed on the day set, even though the Apostolic Bulls of appointment had not then arrived.

The enthronization of the new Bishop in his cathedral church of Harrisburg took place on 23 October, the Right Rev. Mons. M. M. Hassett, D. D., Administrator of the diocese, officiating. A special train carried Bishop McDevitt and his escort of sixty-seven Philadelphia priests to the capital city.

The American Catholic Historical Society gave public expression to its esteem for the new Bishop of Harrisburg in a reception held in his honor on the evening of 17 November at the historic home of the Society. The library was transformed into a bower of palms, autumn leaves, and chrysanthemums, which formed an effective background for the violet robes of the prelates. The guest of honor stood on a dais at the episcopal chair of Archbishop Kenrick and greeted the hundreds who bent to kiss his ring as they were presented by the President of the Society. The occasion was honored by the distinguished presence of His Grace, Archbishop Prendergast, and Bishop McCort. In the receiving line were: the Right Rev. Monsignor Fisher, the Right Rev. Monsignor Henry, the Right Rev. Monsignor Drumgoole, the Rev. James A. Dalton, the Rev. Alvah W. Doran, Mr. James M. Willcox, Dr. Lawrence F. Flick, Mr. Ignatius M. Dohan, and Mr. William V. McGrath. An orchestra furnished delightful music all evening and refreshments were served in the old dining-room, where Mrs. William J. Doyle acted as hostess.

Appended is the text of the Resolutions which were presented by the AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY in beautifully engrossed form to Bishop McDevitt.

WHEREAS it has pleased Divine Providence through the voice of the Holy Father, Pope Benedict the Fifteenth, gloriously reigning, to elevate the Right Reverend Monsignor Philip R. McDevitt to the Apostolic dignity of the Episcopate in designating him fourth Bishop of Harrisburg;

And Whereas, Monsignor McDevitt has been for many years a zealous member of the American Catholic Historical Society; for three terms its President, and always an earnest worker for the aims of the Society and a frequent contributor to its Records;

Be it resolved, that we the President and the Board of Managers of the American Catholic Historical Society, in the name of the members of the Society, extend to Bishop McDevitt our sincerest congratulations and our heartiest "Ad multos annos".

September the nineteenth

Nineteen hundred and sixteen.

William J. Lallou, President,
James M. Willcox, Vice-President,

Edward J. Galbally,
M. F. Hanson,
Thomas A. Daly,
Herman G. Vetterlein
Joseph M. Engel,
Ignatius J. Dohan,
Jane Campbell,
P. A. Kinsley,

Austin O'Malley,
H. T. Henry,
Lawrence F. Flick,
Joseph J. Murphy,
Francis P. Siegfried,
Mary E. Doyle,
H. T. Drumgoole.

THE LIFE OF BISHOP CONWELL

BY MARTIN I. J. GRIFFIN

CHAPTER XXI

HOGAN RETURNS TO PHILADELPHIA.—SUMMARILY OUSTS O'MEALLY FROM HIS RESIDENCE.—IS REPUDIATED BY TRUSTEES.—OFFERS TO FOUND A GREEK CHURCH.—LEAVES PHILADELPHIA.—MARRIES A YOUNG WIDOW.—BECOMES A LAWYER.—STRANGE ESCAPADE IN NEW JERSEY.—MARRIES ANOTHER WIDOW.—ENTERS POLITICS.—AN EDITOR.—U. S. CONSUL.—AUTHOR OF ANTI-CATHOLIC BOOKS.—HIS DEATH.—HIS WIDOW.—REMINISCENCES OF HIS CAREER.

As the summer of 1824 saw the last appearance of Rev. Wm. Hogan in Philadelphia, it is time that we should return to him and relate the close of his career. Bishop Conwell, in a letter to Mgr. Plessis, dated July 11th, 1824, introducing Mr. J. Randall, "an eminent lawyer", "a great friend to us in our troubles", informs the prelate that "Mr. Hogan has returned again and there is great confusion among the schismatics at present".

Hogan had been in Charleston, S. C., since his departure from Philadelphia, and had sent from that city, on March 28th, 1824, the formal resignation of his pastorate alluded to in the last chapter. A notice in the *Catholic Miscellany* of May 19th, 1824, tells how he had been occupied up to that date.

REV. WM. HOGAN.

We did not intend to have this name appear in our paper again, but from the many inquiries that have been made we deem it right to state that he arrived in this city from Liverpool about six weeks since,—that he preached in the Orphan House, in the German Lutheran Church, in the Baptist Church, in the Mariner's Church, and in one of the Presbyterian Churches,—that, as far as we could learn, his sermons principally contained invectives against the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, and that he left here for Jamaica a few days since, for what purpose we know not; and that a paragraph appeared in one of the papers stating that he had resigned the pastorate of St. Mary's Church in Philadelphia upon its being given to a gentleman whom he had recommended and approved of, and another paragraph appeared after his departure stating that he would soon return from Jamaica. As to his objects and views we know nothing, and are as little concerned.

Hogan returned to Philadelphia. His doings upon his arrival are related in an unsigned Ms. dated August 10th, 1824, now in the collection of Samuel Castner, Jr., who on July 11th, 1895, purchased from the author a number of valuable Catholic historical records which he had obtained in a junk shop. This document relates that,

June 14th, 1824, a vessel arrived the day before reporting that it had spoken the Steamer Union at sea from Kingston, Jamaica, on the 3rd, bound for Philadelphia, "with Rev. Wm. Hogan on board". The Union arrived at Philadelphia, Friday night, June 25th, and at 5 o'clock in the morning Hogan reached his house on 4th near Spruce,—had his name replaced on the outside of the door and ordered Rev. Mr. O'Meally (who he had left in St. Mary's church in his place) to depart out of the house or he would be kicked out. Mr. O'Meally left. Next day the papers announced that Hogan would deliver a charity sermon in St. Mary's on Sunday afternoon for the benefit of the poor children. The afternoon papers declared

that he had no right in the said church,—that he was not authorized by the Trustees. On Sunday, O'Meally appeared at St. Mary's and said Mass attended by the Trustees and the High Constable. Hogan appeared in morning and afternoon as "a common hearer". There was no disturbance. Hogan, before leaving for Wilmington, N. C., sued O'Meally for bed and board before Alderman Badger and obtained judgment for the amount of his bill. On August 9th Hogan left in the steamboat to join the ship *Vulture* at Newcastle for Wilmington, N. C., accompanied by his servant.

This last date is an error, for, as we shall see, Hogan was already in Wilmington, and was married there on August 9th. Further details of his visit to Philadelphia are found in the minutes of the Board of Trustees.

At the meeting on July 25th information was given "of intention to disturb the congregation next Sunday". Messrs. Barry and Gallagher were appointed "to take measures to keep the peace". On the 26th they met again and recorded that "The Trustees having received information and perceived a public notice stating the determination of Rev. Wm. Hogan to preach in this church on Sunday next, it was on motion resolved that the Secretary be directed to inform Mr. Hogan that any attempt by him to preach or discharge any pastoral duties in this church for the present will be opposed by the Trustees, and they will hold him accountable for the intrusion and every injury they may sustain therefrom."

The same day they gave notice in the *National Gazette*, as follows:

ST. MARY'S CHURCH.

The Trustees of St. Mary's Church have seen with surprise a notice in one of the morning papers announcing the intention of Rev. Wm. Hogan to preach in that church to-morrow afternoon. They think it their duty to inform the public that the Rev. Wm. Hogan has no authority from them to preach in

said church; that they have received no communication from that gentleman since his abandonment of that church, except a formal resignation of the pastorship, which was then accepted and notified to him by order of the Board.

By order of the Trustees,

A. RANDALL, Sec.

Hogan replied to this notice in the *National Gazette* of June 29th, in a letter which the *Gazette* called "A Curiosity", and justly. He said that the notice of the Trustees "had one happy effect. It has elicited from the Trustees an avowal that they possess the right of conferring pastoral jurisdiction; this unjust and uncanonical usurpation of prerogatives which you have been shrewdly suspected of arrogating to yourselves I have never recognized and never shall, as vested exclusively in laymen". His mind must have been tottering or his assurance was monumental. But he had not lost all his friends though his former adherents on the Board repudiated him. On July 1st application was made to the Board for a copy of the correspondence with Hogan. The request was made by John Dempsey, Chairman, and Alexander Sweeney, Secretary. No record appears to determine whether their wish was granted or not. Hogan's friends secured counsel, and on July 18th the Board received a communication from Joseph R. Ingersoll, Esq., requesting the Trustees in the name of a Committee of the congregation to invite Hogan to "perform pastoral duties". Ingersoll was informed that the request was declined, and an address was issued to give an explanation of the measures adopted by the Trustees.

Bishop Conwell wrote to the Archbishop July 10, 1824, that Bishop England was "involving himself in my affairs", and charges him with corresponding with the man of sin—O'Meally. "Hogan is here and has alarmed them considerably. Catholics have no communication with them, and are disposed to remain so." Rev. Mr. Egan and Rev.

James Smith from Emmittsburg received the order of deaconship here and are to be ordained priests on Sunday in St. Augustine's. The latter to remain at St. Augustine's. Egan to remain with Dubois. Joseph Bonaparte has taken a pew in St. Joseph's—have been with him frequently and said Mass at his country-seat, where a former dining apartment was changed into a chapel,—wish to procure decent chalice and decent ornaments, and also for the Countess a very small altar stone.

It was probably to procure these articles, as well as to confer with the Archbishop, that Bishop Conwell went to Baltimore. Apparently he and the Archbishop differed in some matter regarding the schism, for after his return he writes under date of July 22d:

Returned from Baltimore, "where I got everything done without trouble or delay. Hogan has issued an Address to St. Mary's to secede from the Roman communion. If we lived in any other country there would be nothing to fear,—my desire of being at peace with all mankind, which I still entertain, causes me to wish you were still of my opinion. I shall be absent in Northern Pennsylvania when cool weather comes on."

On July 12th, 1824, the *National Gazette* published a second curiosity of Hogan's:

"O violent change
And whirl of men's affections!"

"Know thyself and make thyself known."

ANOTHER CURIOSITY.

From the United States Gazette of this morning.

*To Six Gentlemen who style themselves, the Trustees of
St. Mary's Church.*

GENTLEMEN:—Permit me to acknowledge myself the writer of some extracts, which you have caused to be published in

the United States Gazette of Friday. They may be found and have been taken from two letters of mine, to a certain young lady not a thousand miles from Mr. John Ashley's; but as I cannot see what bearing my correspondence, with young ladies, or old maids, can have in church controversy, you are not to expect that I shall take much notice of your communication of Friday. I cannot, however, but congratulate you on the important accession you have acquired in being able to enlist on your side the loving and personal charms of this paragon of loveliness.

"————— has wit refined.

But when its points are gleaming round us,
Who can tell, if they're designed
To dazzle merely, or to wound us."

With such support, you must succeed in effectually resisting all papal interference, and episcopal pretensions, in this happy republic; from me you have nothing to apprehend: a single glimpse at this lovely auxiliary of yours is enough to disarm me; nor do I imagine you have much to dread from the Court of Rome: for aught I know, the very rattle of her tongue is sufficient to drown the loudest thunders of the Vatican. But to be serious, Gentlemen, why do you take the liberty of interfering directly, or indirectly, with me? Have I ever applied for permission to preach in St. Mary's Church since my return from Europe? Did I ever come and express a wish to enter that church as Pastor? I believe you must answer in the negative—why, then, interfere with me? Do you expect that I shall submit to your unprovoked attacks without resistance?

"Must I give way and room to your rash choler?
Shall I be frightened when mad men stare?"

I regret being obliged to differ with you, as I once esteemed you much. I must now say of you in the language of the poet—

"We could have hugged the greasy rogues,
They once pleased us."

In conclusion allow me to say, once for all, that in future I shall not notice any communication which bears your signature.

You have forfeited every claim to my confidence, and that of a large and respectable congregation who have placed you in the office you fill, and from which they anxiously wish for an opportunity to remove you.

WILLIAM HOGAN.

The new movement of Hogan's, to which the Bishop referred in his letter of July 22d, was explained by him in an Address published in the morning papers, and re-published, together with a summary of the tenets of the Greek Church, in the *National Gazette* of July 24th. He offered to again become Pastor of St. Mary's if the congregation would call itself the "American Catholic Church" and consider themselves on exact footing with the Greek Catholics.

A THIRD CURIOSITY.

We cannot refrain from giving our Catholic readers the *benefit* of the following address which came forth in one of the morning papers of this city. They will perceive that the *reverend* addresser has become tired of those parts of the doctrines and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church which enjoin *celibacy* and *occasional fasting*. With the reality of his personal griefs we meddle not. The purity of the Greek Church sounds like a discovery.

ADDRESS

TO THE CONGREGATION OF ST. MARY'S CHURCH.

Beloved Brethren:—On my arrival amongst you, I neither anticipated the unusually great attention and marked respect, which you have been pleased to show me, nor was it my intention to have again, in any form, brought my name before the public; but circumstances which I did not anticipate, and over which, from the nature of things, I could have not control, oblige me once more, and I hope for the last time, to solicit a few moments of your attention. This becomes the more necessary, as I have reason to believe you have already been concerting measures for the purpose of inducing me to

resume my pastoral duties, and gone to some expense to meet my supposed exigencies. These additional marks of your sincere attachment for me demand my warmest acknowledgments, but I must respectfully decline any further interference in the concerns of St. Mary's Church, unless under certain conditions, which I shall briefly propose to your consideration; and as to the money, which I understand you are collecting for me, I must also decline receiving any—did my circumstances require it, I should thankfully accept of any sum you were pleased to give me; but Providence has been pleased to bestow on me a property which renders me perfectly independent; however, if any money has been collected, I wish you to present it to the Sunday School and Catechism Society which I have established in this city.

When on the 20th of last November I took my departure for Europe, I then stated to you, in general terms, the nature and object of my visit to that country, which was, in the first place, the recovery of my health, something impaired by a pain in my chest—and secondly, to ascertain what support I might be likely to meet with, towards the better management of our ecclesiastical institutions in this country. Though it is difficult to disturb, and often impossible to counteract, the prejudice of education—still the encouragement I met with more than amply remunerated me for my trouble; but on my arrival in Charleston (S. C.) it was intimated to me that Mr. Meade and five other gentlemen, who style themselves "*The Trustees of St. Mary's Church*", had offered terms of accommodation to the Right Rev. Henry Conwell, predicated upon my removal from said church. This measure so strange, and marked in every feature with inconsistency and bad faith, I of course disapproved of; however, unwilling to pronounce on the merits or demerits of Mr. Meade's conduct, or that of the five gentlemen who have joined him, I wrote to the Trustees of St. Mary's, to ascertain whether or not they gave their corporate sanction to such an act. This simple inquiry into a *circumstance*, the *six Trustees* alluded to, have mistaken for a fact of quite a different nature, and by a most dishonourable and disingenuous concealment of the spirit and phraseology

of my letter, have stated to you that I *resigned*. Here it appears to me, and it could not have escaped your notice, if you have read my letter, that I had to deal with men who, to *carry a point*, could throw candor, truth, and honor in the shade. I now looked upon them as no longer entitled to *my support*, and as preferring to be *Priest-ridden* by Dr. Conwell and his friars, whom, in their pamphlet of September last, they denounced as *drunkards, ambitious, violent, illiterate, mockers of religion*, (vide pamphlet signed R. W. Meade, Jno. Ashley and others,) to the enjoyment of *the liberty of the children of God*; I therefore hailed the circumstance of their misconstruing my letter as a favourable opportunity of retiring from a church where I had suffered much, and breaking off all communication with men in whom confidence was no longer to be reposed; accordingly I have been making some arrangements for the future employment of my time, or retiring entirely from the Ministry. I did not intend to have the pleasure of visiting you until about the beginning of next winter, had not some of these *gentlemen* the assurance to say that *I dare not appear in Philadelphia*. This assertion, so vague and so base, demanded my immediate return—I now feel a pride in giving these *gentlemen of high standing* an opportunity of exercising that miserable, petty malice which they know well I despise, and withholding from me those trifling little attentions which I never courted, and which I seldom stooped to accept of. I shall make no further remarks on the conduct of these gentlemen, as I have already given one of them in charge to my lawyers, Messrs. Sergeant and Ingersoll.

Besides, a tedious and protracted controversy with the emissaries of the Court of Rome, who seem to have lost sight of the pure doctrines of the gospel, who have substituted the traditions and fabulous tales of monks for the revealed will of God, who hold that salvation is not to be obtained through the atonement of Christ, without the instrumentality of means, which have no other effect than to demoralize the human mind and degrade the understanding of man, has given me so perfect an insight into the economy of that Court that I feel myself bound thus publicly to notify you of my intention to retire from St. Mary's Church until it breaks off all connection with it.

Had I left you without a clergyman, my retiring from St. Mary's Church might, perhaps, be censurable, but under existing circumstances you must approve of my determination. It is true, you do not seem to be pleased with the clergyman I left you—you consider him too young and inexperienced to take charge of so large a congregation as yours; this I foresaw, and intended to have remedied by occasionally advising him; but that is at present impracticable.—Several of you have asked me, and you must, ere now, expect a reply, upon what terms I would consent to officiate as your Pastor. From this interrogation I feel no longer privileged to withhold an answer, and this answer I wish you distinctly to understand.—If you declare yourselves independent of the Court of Rome, and insist upon the right of electing your own Bishops and Pastors—if you consent to the free circulation of the scriptures—if you consider yourselves on an exact footing with the Greek Catholics, and will denominate your Church *The American Catholic Church*, I shall feel a pride in being your Pastor. I have dwelt in serious meditation on the doctrines and principles of our Church in those countries where the jurisdiction of Rome is recognized, and in Greece, where it is rejected, and I have come to the conclusion that Rome sanctions an evident departure from their ancient simplicity, and that the Greek Church preserves them in their original purity. I am of the opinion that, until you renounce all allegiance to any foreign court, you cannot become respectable as a religious society, nor can you enjoy peace and comfort among yourselves.

St. Paul, writing to Timothy, 1st Epistle, 4th chapter, says—*"Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies and hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with hot iron, forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth; if thou put the brethren in mind of those things thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ."* If you coincide with me in believing that the period prophesied by the illustrious Paul is arrived, and that the evils which here pre-

sented themselves to his prophetic eye are sanctioned only by the Court of Rome, and in those countries where its universal jurisdiction is admitted, and are willing to co-operate with me in preventing their further introduction into this happy Republic, my time and talents, humble as they are, shall be gratuitously at your service; otherwise I cannot, with the least hope of meliorating your moral condition, consent to accept of any situation, however emolumentary, which you may have the kindness to offer me.

I am aware that some will censure, and others consider me imprudent, in thus candidly avowing my sentiments; but if candor be imprudence, I am never likely to become *wise*, as I have been taught not to sacrifice truth to interest — “truth, though no puritan, can do no harm”. With the sincerest wishes for your present and future happiness, I remain your humble servant,

WILLIAM HOGAN.

Philadelphia, July 22, 1824.

During the month of July, Hogan acted as one of the judges in a public disputation between the R^{év}. Messrs. W. L. McCalla and Abner Kneeland, Protestant ministers, on the question: Is the punishment of the wicked absolutely eternal? Or is it only a temporal punishment in this world for their good, to be succeeded by eternal happiness after death? The substance of this discussion was printed and published by T. S. Manning, 11 S. Sixth St., Philadelphia, pp. 40, 8vo.

Hogan's suggestion of the establishment of an “American Catholic Church” seems to have met with little or no favor, even from the faction who still adhered to him. As for his old friends the Trustees, they were on terms of open defiance with him. On August 8th they ordered that any vestments or other property of Hogan's remaining under their control should be given up to him, and that he should be requested to hand over anything belonging to the corporation yet in his possession. On or previous to this

date, as we have seen, he took shipping for Wilmington, N. C.

There on August 9th, 1824, he was married to a young widow, Mrs. Henrietta McKay. The *Democratic Press* reported the event thus:

On Thursday, August 9th, was married in Wilmington, N. C., the Rev. Wm. Hogan, the late pastor of the Roman Catholic Church of St. Mary's, Philadelphia, to Mrs. McKay, of North Carolina.

And the *Gazette* of Sept. 3d:

The following annunciation ought not to be overlooked. We anticipated it when we read the reverend pastor's project of a Greek church. Married.—At Wilmington, N. C., the Rev. Wm. Hogan, late pastor of St. Mary's church in this city, to Mrs. McKay of that place.

Mrs. McKay "possessed, in addition to her personal charms, the agreeable merit of owning property" (Thompson Westcott, *Memoir of Father Hurley*). It was doubtless due to this agreeable merit that Hogan could make the offer which he made in October, to contribute \$2,000 towards the erection of a Greek Catholic Church in Philadelphia. Mrs. Hogan, the first, died within sixteen months after her second marriage, January 1st, 1826, at Wilmington, N. C. At her death she was only twenty-two years old. Hogan remained during her life in Wilmington, studying law and preaching in Protestant churches; he "settled down to the sober career of matrimony, or what he called matrimony", as Bishop England wrote in his *Miscellany*, Dec. 15th. On Feb. 25th, 1825, he preached in the French Protestant Church of Wilmington, and on March 21st, 1826, he was admitted to practice law in the Courts of South Carolina. He never returned to Philadelphia, as far as the records extant show, though Bishop Conwell wrote

on Oct. 3d that he was expected there in the following January. He may possibly have visited the city when near it in Sept., 1826. During that month he became the hero of the remarkable escapade related in several of the papers. The account which follows was published in the *New York Enquirer*, the *New Jersey Mirror*, and *Burlington County Advertiser*, of Mt. Holly, N. J., on Oct. 4th, 1826.

FROM THE NEW-YORK ENQUIRER.

Clerical Movements.—The Rev. Mr. Hogan, we believe, is well known in Philadelphia, if not in this city, and has been distinguished as the cause of considerable commotion in the former place. He has recently paid a visit to New-Jersey, and in some dispute the Rev. Gentleman sent his antagonist a challenge to fight a duel. Instead of meeting Mr. Hogan in the usual way, not with “Bell Book and candle”, but with hair-triggers, “lint, probestick and plaister”, he very fairly hauled him over to the Grand Jury, and he was indicted for challenging “against the statute in such cases made and provided”; but the Rev. Gentleman, not recognizing any court except the ecclesiastical court, refused to obey the mandates of the law, and actually drew a pair of pistols on the officers—put them at defiance, and came off to New-York. Here he was arrested as a fugitive from Justice, and lodged in Bridewell. An attempt was made, without effect, to liberate him by habeas corpus, and his friends interfered. They obtained and paid for his passage to Liverpool, on board the *William Byrnes*, and Mr. Hogan was escorted on board, bag and baggage, and set sail with a fair wind. When in sight of the lighthouse, the Rev. Gentleman turned to the Captain, told him he was forced on board his vessel against his will, and if he did not put him on board the pilot boat then under the lee, he would, on his arrival at Liverpool, arrest him for false imprisonment. Captain Hackstaff, thus addressed by one of his passengers, and not relishing legal process at the end of the voyage, sent Mr. Hogan on board the pilot boat, from which he was transferred at his own desire to the *President*, bound for Charles-

ton, she under full sail, clearing the Light House, and in a few days the Rev. Mr. Hogan may reach the capital of South Carolina, and "further the deponent saith not".

The *Aurora and Franklin Gazette*, Philadelphia, Sept. 30, 1824, prints the same narrative practically verbatim, and then continues:

Mr. Harris, who is one of the most amiable and respectable young gentlemen in the country, and of unquestioned firmness and courage, has advertised "that Wm. Hogan having fled from the justice of the State of New Jersey, any person who will deliver the said fugitive to the civil authorities of Burlington County, State of New Jersey, or those of the City of New York, will be handsomely rewarded by the subscriber, residing in Moorestown, New Jersey. The said Hogan was confined in the Bridewell of the City of New York for some time, preparatory to his being removed to the State of New Jersey for trial; he was discharged on condition of his leaving the Country, and was put on board the ship William Byrnes for Liverpool on the 24th Inst. After getting to the Hook he contrived to be transferred to the ship President bound to Charleston, S. C., where he formerly resided."

Hogan, however, remained at Charleston. On February 24th, 1827, the *Gazette* announced the death in Augusta, Georgia, of William Hogan, attorney-at-law, late of Charleston, and formerly of Philadelphia. Hogan seems to have been in Georgia, but was not dead or dying. On January 28th, 1828, he married again — this time another wealthy young widow, Mrs. Lydia White Gardner. The author is indebted to James F. Brennan, Esq., of Peterborough, N. H., for the following information in regard to her:

Lydia W., the second wife of William Hogan, was born and died at Petersborough, New Hampshire. She was the daughter of Daniel Gibbs, the first stage-driver in that town.

Her first husband, John Gardner, was a wealthy Southern planter, who sold his lands and slaves and retired with a competency, at his death leaving his money to his widow. The record on page 92 of the *Petersborough Town History*, among the children of Daniel Gibbs, reads as follows:

“Lydia W., born August 29, 1798, married John Gardner; second husband, Rev. William Hogan, January, 1828, in Savannah, Ga. He died January, 1848, aged 52 years. She died in Petersborough, September 20, 1875, aged 77 years.”

At her death her property, consisting of money and securities to the amount of \$8,000 or \$10,000, descended, as her only heir at law, to her brother Asa's daughter, Sarah S., wife of James S. White, with whom she had lived for many years and at whose residence in Petersborough village she died. Mrs. Hogan's body was buried in the Asa Gibbs' lot, which is situated north of the Main Avenue, near the Town Receiving Tomb, in the Village Cemetery at Petersborough. In this lot is the monument to the memory of Asa Gibbs, his two wives and two sisters, and at the north end of the lot is the grave of Mrs. Hogan, marked by a plain but substantial Italian marble gravestone on which the following inscription appears:

LYDIA W.,
wife of
WILLIAM HOGAN,
died
Sept. 20, 1875,
AE. 77 yrs.

Mrs. Hogan was a woman of intelligence and of a quiet and retiring disposition; she remained at home the most of her time during her last years, visiting little or none.

From the date of his second marriage the records afford

no evidence of his career until 1842. In that year he went to Boston, and was engaged in politics and journalism. He became clerk of the Custom House, and editor of the *Daily American*. He was appointed U. S. Consul at Neuvas, Cuba, on October 11th, 1843, during a recess of the Senate, and on January 30th, 1844, was reappointed and confirmed by the Senate. He asserted in "High and Low Mass", a volume published by him in 1846 (pp. 175-184), that for reasons on file in Washington, the Secretary of State sent him to Mexico, ostensibly with despatches to our Minister, but in reality for other purposes, to discover the intentions of the clergy in Mexico, in relation to slavery and the annexation of Texas. This statement is untrue, or at least not borne out by the evidence to which he appeals. The Chief Clerk of the Department of State wrote to the author on Sept. 28th, 1900: "It does not appear from the records of this Department that he was sent on any mission to Mexico".

Hogan published several works, which if we may judge by their titles were in the usual style of men of his type. Among them were: "Popery as it Was and Is", "Nunneries and Auricular Confession", "High and Low Mass". The Preface of the last is dated Nashville, October 26th, 1846. In it he said: "The present volume will be read a long time after I am cold in the grave. I never valued lip service of any kind nor in any form. I desire the friendship and good opinion of all men. Their esteem is of inestimable value, and could I merit and carry it to my grave, I might calmly exclaim at the hour of dissolution: 'O Death, where is thy sting?'"

Of the schism he said: "My first difficulty with the Romish Church was in Philadelphia, and the cause was one in which I now pride myself, and should gather around me every Roman Catholic in the United States. It was their cause; it was the cause of God, of Scriptural Science,

and civil rights that I struggled for; and if I am spared I will call upon them for aid and support to carry out the principles which I then advocated, and for which I am ready, should my health permit it, to struggle and suffer again."

Hogan's anti-Catholic writings were on a plane with the vilest and most scurrilous type of the "ex-priest", and "ex-nun" literature. The editor is not informed whether any copies are now in existence, but they were quoted extensively in another work of this type, "Why Priests Should Wed", by Justin D. Fulton, D.D., Boston, 1888.

A few of Hogan's expressions, quoted by Fulton, may serve to give some idea of how far he had fallen:

The strangling and putting to death of infants is a common every-day crime in popish nunneries. (Popish Nunneries, p. 61; apud Fulton, p. 162.)

American husbands, . . . I make these statements in an earnest desire for you, to prevent you, if possible, from permitting your wives and daughters to go in future to those dens of vice called confessionals. (Popish Nunneries, p. 65; apud Fulton, p. 150.)

Every village curé, just from the Seminary, healthy, robust and vigorous, doubtless loves one of his parishioners. There is no vow which holds good. (Auricular Confession, p. 40; apud Fulton, p. 40.)

Further quotation of this mendacious filth were useless. It shows clearly that Hogan had sunk to the level of Chiniquy, Gavin, Maria Monk, and others, side by side with whom Fulton quotes him.

It has been stated that Hogan and his wife became members of the Olivet Street Church when Rev. Austin Richards was pastor. But Mr. Jos. L. Clough, Clerk of that (Pilgrim) church, wrote to the author on Mar. 21st, 1901, that "after a careful examination of the membership roll for the thirty or more years Rev. Austin Richards was

pastor and for two or three years before and subsequent to that time I fail to find any record of any member of the name of Hogan."

Hogan died in Nashua, January 23d, 1848. His death was announced in the *Gazette* of Nashua as follows: "Rev. Wm. Hogan died at the Central House, January 23d. He was the author of several books on Catholicism."

His mind seems to have run very much upon death and the grave when he was writing the preface of "High and Low Mass", only fifteen months before his death. The historian delving among the dusty records of the past, finds nothing to assure him that the thought inspired him with regret or repentance for the evil he had done and the incurable wrong he had helped to bring upon the Church of Philadelphia, and upon the souls of countless Philadelphians. Let us hope that the recording angel may find such an event recorded in his books.

We have given more than one eulogy of Hogan's good parts from the pens of his friends. Here is an estimate of his attainments from that of Rev. Henry G. Ganss in his "History of St. Patrick's Church, Carlisle, Pa.": "Hogan was a man of conspicuously handsome person, of most suave and engaging manners, with rare and charming conversational gifts, a ready and eloquent preacher, a man who, could he have curbed a most inordinate vanity and passionate ambition, would have been on the highway to ecclesiastical preferment. His egotism and pride were unduly encouraged and pampered by an adulatory host of laymen, who, whilst they admired his brilliant intellectual attainments, were blind to the absence of those virtues that more than aught else constitute the ideal priest."

Of his writings, in particular of his pamphlets issued during the controversy in Philadelphia, Bishop England says (*Works*, V, p. 196):

The holders of the Church, to vindicate their conduct, put forward publications which we cannot designate with milder phrases than compilations of acrimonious unproved charges, miserably deficient of argument, gross misapprehensions of canon law, and ecclesiastical discipline, and the exhibition as of authority, of the opinion of every censured clergyman who could be induced to put his name to any document, however ridiculous, purporting that they were right; everything was ransacked and everybody examined, from Adam and Eve in Paradise down to the Spanish Cortes and the Sardinian Consul. And all this to prove an impossibility, viz., that the right of patronage existed where it had never been created, and in the midst of a chaos which did not contain even the materials from which it could be formed.

Rev. P. A. Jordan wrote as follows of the sequelae of his revolt:

All who favored him came to an unfortunate end. It used to be a common remark: "So-and-so is dead—wasn't it a fearful death?" "No wonder," would be the response, "they were Hoganites." I know of but two remaining, a very aged lady and her son; and I must confess I wait with not a little curiosity to hear of their death. The ancient dame I have not seen for years; the son is a penitent of one of ours, and daily visits the Church and devoutly prays before Him Who has never been petitioned in vain for pardon; and if humble prayer can avert the temporal punishment due to certain sins, I hope his death will be a proof of it. It is also sad to notice that the son of one of the leaders of that unholy schism—whose memory his country will cherish for ages, if she lasts so long, as her savior—died yesterday, Nov. 6th, 1872, outside of the pale of the Church, and his funeral services are to take place at St. Mark's Protestant Episcopal Church.—Truly the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children to many generations.

This person was Gen. Geo. G. Meade, son of R. W.

Meade, who was born in Spain, Dec. 30th, 1815, while his father was Consul at Lisbon. He was baptized in the Catholic Church, January 8th, 1816. His godmother was Christina Gordon y Prendergast, mother of Don Luis y Prendergast, Marquis of Las Tunas and Captain General of Cuba—all Catholics. (Admiral Meade, July, 1889.)

After Hogan's death, his widow returned to her home at Petersborough, and lived there very quietly until her death at 77 years of age, on September 20th, 1875. There is a portrait of Hogan in the possession of the Pennsylvania Historical Society.

So the most prominent figure in the schism passed away. As to his personal appearance, and his engaging manners, his contemporaries are the only possible judges. And here all the evidence is in his favor. For his literary and controversial ability, the editor, after reading much that he wrote, can see no reason to dissent from Bishop England's opinion given above. As a controversialist he had a happy knack of detecting flaws in the policy and the arguments of his opponents, and of these he had not a few to exercise his arts upon. He had a glib assurance of thought and expression, which his contemporaries seem to have admired, and many men of that time of unquestionable parts show the same tendency. We, however, would consider such a style an evidence of shallowness. It enabled him, however, "to make the worse appear the better reason", in the eyes of his followers, and possibly sometimes in his own. He had but one literary virtue that our day might approve, and that a dubious one: a talent for copious, though often inaccurate and unhappy quotation, especially from Shakespeare and the Holy Scriptures. As for his moral character, his moral responsibility for the great and indisputable evils of which he was in great part the cause, the case has long since been removed to a higher tribunal than ours.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

HISTORICAL NOTES.

Through the courtesy of Sister Mary Antonella Hardy, the writer of the interesting "Hymn of a Century" in the June issue of the HISTORICAL RECORDS, the Sisters of Loretto have presented to the Society two valuable hymn books :

1. Collection of Sacred Hymns for the Use of the Catholic Church in Kentucky. Printed by Bard & Edrington, Bardstown, 1815.
 2. Collection of Sacred Hymns for the use of the Children of the Catholic Church. Webb & Levering, Louisville, 1853.
-

From the same source we learn that the Mother House of the Sisters of Loretto, Loretto, Kentucky, possesses an autographed presentation copy of *The Spanish Hymn* which was "arranged and composed for the concerns of the Musical Fund Society, Philadelphia", by Benjamin Carr, and printed by G. E. Blake. This copy contains the following printed explanation: "The Spanish Hymn in full score was performed at the seventh concert of the Musical Fund Society on the 29th of December, 1824, and was repeated at their eight concert on the 22nd of March following: the solo part by Miss E. Jefferson, the accompanying quartett by Miss H. C. Taws, Mr. J. C. Taws, Mr. T. Carr, and Mr. B. Cross; and the chorus by the ladies and gentlemen of the choral department." The same institution also possesses a copy of the *Ave Maris Stella*, by P. Kelly of St. Mary's College, Baltimore, published by John Cole. The copyright bears the date of July 29, 1826.

The Catholic Alumni Sodality of Philadelphia has lately issued a pamphlet entitled *Catalog of Catholic Books in the Free Library of Philadelphia* (Central Branch). Under nineteen headings (History, Literature, Science, Religion, etc.) are grouped some two thousand volumes by Catholic writers, together with directions showing the location of the books in the Central Branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia. Apart from its use as a work of reference, it might serve as a Reader's Guide for Philadelphia Catholics. We congratulate the Alumni Sodality and hope that their work will be imitated in all our large cities.

BOOK REVIEWS

INDEX OF "THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL RESEARCHES." Comprising All Its Issues: Volumes I to XXIX—July, 1884 to July, 1912. American Catholic Historical Society, Philadelphia, 1916. Pp. iv—320. Price, \$5.00.

Within the covers of the twenty-nine volumes of the late Mr. Martin I. J. Griffin's historical quarterly are gathered data of inestimable value for the student of American Catholic history. In order to give ready access to these chronicles and documents, a complete list of references to the subjects treated is here presented. The work of compilation had been undertaken by Dr. William L. J. Griffin, son of the late historian, and it was the compiler's intention to publish the volume himself. As he was obliged to defer from time to time the carrying-out of his plan, he decided to offer the manuscript to the American Catholic Historical Society, with the request that the Society take over the copyright of the work and assume the expenses of its publication. This proposal was agreed to by the Board of Managers of the Society, in order that the fruits of the labor of the late Mr. Griffin should be made more available for the workers in the domain which he cultivated so assiduously for many years.

In July of 1884 the Right Rev. A. A. Lambing, A. M., of Wilkesburg, Pa., began to edit and publish the quarterly magazine entitled "*Historical Researches* in Western Pennsylvania—Principally Catholic." A year later, at the end of the first volume, *Catholic* was prefixed to the title. In December of 1886 the quarterly was transferred to Mr. Griffin, and its name became *American Catholic Historical Researches*. So it continued until the end of the twenty-ninth volume, in July, 1912. Meantime, on 10 October, 1911, the indefatigable delver into the sources of Catholic annals in America died,

and the quarterly from that time was continued by Dr. William L. J. Griffin, until it was combined with the RECORDS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PHILADELPHIA. The first issue of the joint periodicals appeared in September, 1912. This *Index* therefore covers all the numbers of the *Researches* from the initial issue in July, 1884, until its merging into the RECORDS twenty-nine years later.

During this period the late historian gathered the most valuable source documents of the history of the Church in America, and published them, often with illuminating commentary, in the pages of his magazine. This wealth of fact and information is now happily made accessible to the public through the excellent *Index* just published. It is a most important addition to our historical literature, and our readers will be glad to know that copies may be had by applying to the office of the Society.

INDEX

LIST OF ARTICLES

	PAGE
Address of the President. Rev. William J. Lallou	I-5
Capuchins in Acadia and Northern Maine, The, Rev. John Lenhart, O.M.Cap.	191-229, 300-327
Controversy, An Old Time. Rev. Joseph J. Murphy, J.C.D.	133-144, 242-258, 328-336
Conwell, Life of Bishop. Martin I. J. Griffin.	74-87, 145-160, 275-283, 359-378
De Smet, Father Peter. Rev. Joseph M. Corrigan, D.D.	95-112, 259-275
Durand (Dunand), Epistle or Diary of Rev. Marie Joseph. Ella M. E. Flick.	45-64
Griffith, Unveiling of Portrait of Martin I. J. Miss Jane Campbell.	11-14
Helbron, Greensburg Baptismal Register of Rev. Peter. Copied by Rev. Father John, O.S.B.; translated by Lawrence F. Flick, M.D., LL.D.	65-73, 161-174, 346-355
History of the Catholic Summer School of America. Rev. Morgan M. Sheedy, LL.D.	287-295
Hymn of a Century. Sister M. Antonella Hardy	113-126
Hymnary, Notes on Father Nerinckx's. Rt. Rev. Mgr. H. T. Henry, Litt.D.	296-299
Iturbide, Don Agustin. Augustin De Iturbide	16-44
Kenrick, The Work of Bishop in Philadelphia, F.E.T.	337-345
Nerinckx, Rev. Charles. Rev. Joseph J. Murphy, J.C.D.	127-132
Notes, Historical	175-176, 284-286, 379-380
Our Philadelphia. Rt. Rev. P. R. McDevitt	181-190
Reception to Monsignor Bonzano	88-89
Reception to Bishop McDevitt	356-359
Report of Board of Managers for 1915	610
Reuss, Autobiographical Notes of Francis X.	177-180
Through South America's Southland. Rev. Francis P. Siegfried.	230-241

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Campbell, Miss Jane	11-14
Corrigan, D.D., Rev. Joseph M.	95-112, 259-275
Flick, Miss Ella M. E.	45-64
Flick, M. D., LL.D., Lawrence F.	65-73, 161-174, 346-355

	PAGE
Griffin, Martin I. J.	74-87, 145-160, 275-283, 359-378
Hardy, Sister M. Antonella	113-126
Henry, Litt.D., Rt. Rev. Mgr. H. T.	296-299
Iturbide, Augustin De	16-44
John, O.S.B., Father	65-73, 161-174, 346-355
Kenny, S.J., Rev. Lawrence J.	176
Lallou, Rev. William J.	1-5, 90-91
Lenhart, O.M.Cap., Rev. John	191-229, 300-327
McDevitt, Rt. Rev. P. R.	181-190
Murphy, J.C.D., Rev. Joseph J.	127-132, 133-144, 242-258, 328-336
O'Malley, M.D., Austin	285
Reuss, Francis X.	177-180
Sheedy, LL.D., Rev. Morgan M.	287-295
Siegfried, Rev. Francis P.	230-241

BOOK REVIEWS

De Smet, Rev. Peter. E. Laveille, S.J.; tr. by Marion Lindsay.	95-112, 259-275
Diary and Visitation Record of Bishop Kenrick	337-345
French in the Heart of America, The. John Finley.....	90-91
Historical Review, The Catholic	92
Index of the American Catholic Historical Researches	381
Nerinx, Rev. Charles, by Rev. W. J. Howlett	127-132
Our Philadelphia. Elizabeth Robins Penwell	181-190
Through South America's Southland. Rev. J. A. Zahm, C.S.C....	230-241

ILLUSTRATIONS

Loretto Picture	123
Rt. Rev. Philip R. McDevitt	190
Signature of Father Dunand (Durand)	176
Abenaki Indians	303
Acadia and Northern Maine, The Capuchins in, 191-229, 300-327, limits of, 191, French settlements in, 204, population, 216, life in, 221.	
Algonquin Indians	303
American Catholic Historical Society—	
Annual Address of the President	1-5
Committees	15
New Members	6-7
Reception to Mgr. Bonzano	88
Reception to Bishop McDevitt	356
Resolutions to Bishop McDevitt	358
Report of Managers	6-10
Ashley, Rev. Jonathan	133-144

INDEX

385

	PAGE
Associates, Company of One Hundred in Acadia	201, 326
Athelize, Abbe	155
Badin, Rev. Stephen	128
Balthazar of Paris	301, 324
Baptismal Registers of Greensburg, Pa.	65-73, 161-173, 346-355
Bardstown	128
Barefooters	300
Bedford, Pa.	341
Bible, The Cummiskey	150
Bishop's Burial Ground	281
Bonzano, Mgr.	88
Bonaparte, Charles	155, 156
Bonaparte, Joseph	363
Briand, Pierre	312
Buffalo Creek	340
Campbell, S.J., Rev. Thomas	307
Canso, Cape	306, 317
Capuchins in Acadia and Northern Maine	191-229, 300-327
Cardinal, The Grey	193
Castine (Pentagoet)	203
Catalogue of Catholic Books	380
Cathedral, Proposed Philadelphia, 279; Cemetery, St. Mary's	280
Cesinale, Rev. Rocco, O.M.Cap.	326
Chedabucto	216
Chambersburg	341
Chesterton, Cecil	8
Cliff Haven	287
Company of One Hundred Associates	201, 204, 311
Company of New France	207, 311, 314
Conewago	341
Conquistadores	231
Consecration of Bishop McDevitt	356
Conway, Matthias	76
Cosmas of Mantz, Father	307
Cummiskey, Rev. Eugene	150
Council Bluffs, St. Joseph's Mission	107
Danville, Ky.	130
Dardine (Darden), Tenn.	51
D'Aunay, Charles	210, 211, 215, 220, 306, 310, 313
D'Aunay, Madame	212
Davis, Bishop John	119
De Brice, Madame	228
Denys, Nicholas	216
Deerfield	136, 335
De Smet, Rev. Peter, S.J.	95-112, 259-264
Druillettes, S.J., Father	302, 304, 307
Dubourg, Bishop, 48, and Abbate Inglesi, 79, and Bishop Conwell, 80.	
Durand (Dunand), Rev. Marie Joseph, 45, in upper Louisiana, 47, Wisconsin, 47, correct name, 176.	
Echavarre, General	28
Emperor of Mexico, Iturbide	25

	PAGE
Encomienda system	236
England, Bishop	146, 152, 153, 362
English in Acadia	319, 326
Financial Condition of Acadian Missions	211
Flaget, Bishop	47
Flathead Indians	106, 259
Flood, Dr. H. Grattan	126, 296, 299
Florissant	99
France, Company of New	207
Franciscans in Canada	199
Gans, Rev. H. G.	376
Gasparri, S.J., Rev. D. M.	124
Gonday, Lydia	335
Goshenhoppen	341
Greensburg Baptismal Registers	65, 171, 346
Griffin, Martin I. J., Portrait Unveiled, 11, Index of Researches, 381.	
Hardy, Sister M. Antonella	113, 379
Harold, Rev. William	80, 279
Harrisburg	341
Hogan, Rev. Wm.	74, 85, 145, 275, 358, 363-369, 370-377
Holy Name Society, First in America	130
Huguenots in Acadia	213
Indian Agencies	271
Indian Missions, 101, in Acadia, 209, 221, 230.	
Indians, Kalispels	261
Indians, Iroquois	106
Ignatius of Paris, Rev.	217, 220, 301, 320
Inglesi, Abbate, career, 74-75, in Europe, 79, character, 81-85, 157.	
Iturbide, Don Augustin de, enters Mexico, 19, Masonic opposition, 19, elected Emperor, 25, abdicates, 29, executed, 37, character, 41-44.	
Iturbide, Madame, at Georgetown, 39, Philadelphia, 39, visits President Polk, 174, date of death, 175.	
Jesuits in Canada	192, 198, 222, 304, 312
Jordan, Rev. P. A.	377
Joseph, Père	193
Jubilee of Catholic High School, Philadelphia	175
Kalispel Indians	261
Kennebec, Missions on	305
Kenny, Father	145
Kenny, S.J., Rev. Lawr.	176
Kickapoo Indians	102
Lafayette in Philadelphia	283
La Heve	202, 210, 216, 315
Lambing, Rev. A. A.	381
Lamy, Bishop	124
Lancaster	87, 341
Larissy, Rev. Philip	157

INDEX

387

	PAGE
Latour, Charles	203, 210, 213, 216
Latour, Fort	204, 208
Latour, Madame	214
Laval, Bishop	223
Lazarists	50
Le Borgne	228, 315
Lewistown	341
Liberator, see Iturbide.	
Loretto, Pa.	341
Loretto, Ky., Picture of, 122, Sisters of, 126, Songs of, 116-119, 296-299.	
Loughlin, Mgr. James	288
Lower Granville	203
Mareschal, Archbishop	80
Marquette, Death of Father	63
Mary's, St.	75
Masonry in Mexico	19
McDevitt, Bishop, Reception to, 356, Bishop of Harrisburg, 285, Resolutions to, 358.	
Meade, Richard	85, 150
Meade, General George	377
Mexico and Spain	23
Mexico, Emperor of	25
Miers, Rev. Servandus	87
Miscou	306
Missouri, Indian Missions in	98
Mosher, Warren E.	288
Nepigiguit	218, 320
Newman, Cardinal	177
Nerinckx, Rev. Charles	97, 112, 127, 296
Newry	341
O'Meally (O'Mealy, O'Malley), Rev. Thaddeus... 145, 148, 152, 285,	360
Oregon, Father De Smet in	268
Osage Indians	101
Père, Joseph	193, 200
Pentagoet, Fort (Castine)	202, 208, 218, 301, 316
Plattsburg	289
Pittsburg	340
Pleasant Mills, N. J.	341
Plessis, Mgr.	74
Portland Point, N. B.	219
Port Royal	201, 210, 218, 308
Potawattomie Indians	102
Pottsville	341
Propaganda and Acadia	197, 200, 208, 218, 322
Quebec, Capture of	201
Razilly, Isaac de Launoy de, 199, in Acadia	206, 210, 313
Reception to Mgr. Bonzano, 88, to Bishop McDevitt	356
Recollects in Acadia	192, 205, 212

	PAGE
Reuss, Francis X.	177
Ricco, Rev. John	86
Richelieu, Cardinal	192, 193, 198
Rosati, Bishop	100, 107
Sable, Cape (Fort Latour)	204
Sacred Heart, Ladies of	99
Santa Anna, General	18, 27, 33
St. Augustine's Church	158
St. Genevieve	131
St. Jean Fort	210, 214
St. Joseph's Church	151, 158
St. Louis College	100
School, Catholic High, Philadelphia	175
Seminary, Indian, in Acadia, 222, 227, 313, for girls	227, 336
Shea, John Gilmary	217, 304, 317
Sillery, 304, baptismal records	307
Silver Lake	341
Sitting Bull	270
Spanish Hymn	379
Stabat Mater	299
Sulpician Seminary	223, 229
Trembley, Francis (Père Joseph)	193
Trenton	341
Trustees of St. Mary's	85, 274
Van Quickenbourne, Father	98, 101
Verreydt, Father	103
Willcox, James M.	176
Wilmington	341
Ximenes, Ring of Cardinal	155
Youngstown	341

E
184
C3A4
v.27

American Catholic Historical
Society of Philadelphia
Records

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
